

A motion was made and seconded that the Board recommend to City Council that the present parking restriction of ONE HOUR be changed to TWO HOURS on Kalamazoo Plaza, south side of street from River St. to the east end of the street.

Carried.

A motion was made and seconded that the Board commend the Parks Department and the Public Service Department for plowing and snow removal on the Parking Mall and other City Parking Lots.

Carried.

A discussion was held relative to the parking congestion and problems in the

1500 block of Linval and 500 block of N. Chestnut. No action was taken at this time.

A discussion was held relative to the North Washington Mall. A motion was made and seconded that the Board reaffirm its approval of the North Washington Mall.

Carried.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 8:25 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,
LANSING TRAFFIC BOARD,
ALLEN T. HAYES,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, January 3, 1967

Meeting called to order at 7:40 P.M. by Chairman Ramona J. Bretz.

Grand River Avenue, from "A" one family to "F" commercial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Bretz, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—5.

Absent: Black, Fink and Heino—3.

Z-4-67

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 4613 N. Grand River Avenue, from "A" one family to "F" commercial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

HEARINGS

Z-2-67

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 5341 S. Pennsylvania Avenue from "A" one family to "G-2" wholesale district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-197-66

Mr. Theodore W. Swift, Attorney, for Super Par Oil Co., Inc. appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone a parcel at 917 E. Cavanaugh from "E-2" drive-in shop to "F" commercial district. Mr. Swift advised that this is an existing gasoline service station. They propose to set up a redemption center changing the use of the property. The primary use will remain a gasoline service station. They will close the service bays and stock merchandise connected with the redemption center. Articles

Z-3-67

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 4601 N.

can be purchased at retail. The station now covers 18,000 square feet. They plan no physical expansion, however will alter. Service bays will be used for the redemption center. Merchandise will be generally tires, tables, moderate appliances, etc. Parking they believe is adequate. The building occupies 1/12 of the total site. They could accommodate 10 to 15 cars. He mentioned other stations in this area that are now closed.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-198-66

Mr. Theodore W. Swift, Attorney, appeared for Super Par Oil Inc., in behalf of the petition to rezone a parcel at 3506 N. East Street, from "A" one family to "F" commercial district. This property is to be used the same as that of Z-197-66. Mr. Swift, presented pictures of the existing stations. Building and site plans have been filed. This site is located in a commercialized strip of the city on US 127. It joins retail and faces commercial. They will be modernizing and relighting. The station uses 14,000 square feet, so 90% is uncluttered. Parking will be for 10 to 15 cars. Feel there will be less parking than if a service station. This will be an in and out type of operation.

Mr. Reynolds, asked if the buildings will be enlarged, and was informed that they will not. Mr. Reynolds then asked if the building were rezoned as requested, the parking area rezoned for parking, and the pumps remaining as is, would this be satisfactory, and was advised that it would be.

Mr. Swift then added that they thought they had covered everything, but when they started the alterations, found that the rezoning was needed.

Mr. Guernsey, asked if they had completed any work, and was advised that they had.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-199-66

Mr. John L. Cote, Attorney, appeared in behalf of Mr. Robert O. Ridenour, Trustee for the Jehovah Witnesses, in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 3615 W. Jolly Road, from "A" one family to "B" one family district. Mr. Cote, informed that the petition is for the construction of a church. A house on the property has been condemned. He mentioned the uses in the area. Plans were presented and explained. The value will be \$40,000 to \$45,000. They have a congregation of 100 members which may be expanded to 150. The church building will be set back approximately 30 feet

from the lot line. The building will be 70 feet long and 40 feet wide. The driveway is 10 feet and may be expanded to 12 feet. The balance of the property is to be rezoned to "J" parking. The driveway and parking area will be black topped. Lights will be attached to the building and on the driveway area.

Mr. Ridenour and other trustees of the church were in the audience.

Mr. Siebert, asked the lot dimensions and was informed that they are about 110 ft. x 78 ft. Balance will consist of 365 ft. x 78 ft. site. They will use about 8,580 square feet for the "B" and 37,050 for the "J" parking.

Mr. Gaus, asked if this would be a joint drive on the West, and was advised that this is within the boundary lines of the property, and within 8 ft. of the property line.

Mrs. Bretz, asked for a clarification, if it would be a 64 ft. side without the driveway, and was advised that it is.

Mr. Gaus, remarked that the lot on the sketch looked too small, and Mr. Cote informed the Board that the petitioners had options for additional property.

Mr. Guernsey suggested the attorney make a correction of the legal submitted. Mr. Cote was further informed that Jolly Road is an arterial highway and that the setback may have to be increased. Mr. Cote replied that he was sure his clients would be agreeable to any setbacks that were necessary.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-200-66

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 4616 S. Logan and vacant lot to the south, from "A" one family residence to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-201-66

Mr. Clyde J. Olin, appeared for Mr. Nicholas C. Jeffries, in behalf of the petition to rezone a parcel at 5757 S. Cedar Street, from "D" apartments to "F" commercial district. The site plans and drawings of the proposed building were presented.

Property was originally zoned "F" and then the owner had it rezoned to "D" apartment. Nothing was ever constructed on the property. This was the Halfway House Restaurant and is now vacant and

quite run down. Purchaser of this property planning on making it a beauty salon. Plans call for 3,000 square feet of building with 19+ sq. ft. of land area. There will be ample parking if the building is placed on the north end of the property. At the intersection of Kaynorth and US 127, there will be ample parking. Between Cedar and ROW 67 ft. of the old Jackson Inter Urban the ROW is not being used and gives a good entrance and exit to the property. 20-25 parking spaces will be provided which they believe is more than will be required for this type of business.

Mr. Siebert, asked how many operators are expected, and was informed 24 will be there. They expect to have 12 during the day and 12 during the evenings.

Mr. Reynolds, asked about the curb cut and was advised that there is none along there. They would not enter off both streets as there is a low grade here.

Mr. Manz, asked who owns the 67 ft. right-of-way, and was advised that as far as it is known, this is owned by the highway department.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-202-66

Mr. James Walter, Realtor, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone a parcel at 220 N. Chestnut Street from "D" apartment to "D-1" professional offices district. Mr. Walter, explained that he thought this would be a logical zoning request for the area. There is a parking lot now to accommodate about 12 cars.

Mr. Reynolds, asked if the structure would be torn down, and was advised that it would be remodeled.

Mr. Walters then added that they had applied for rezoning for "D" about a year ago, and the Board recommended "D-1" which was turned down by City Council. They had completed some remodeling, but were stopped by the City Building Inspector.

Mr. Siebert, asked if their business alone is in the building, and was advised that three other people are in the rooms upstairs. They are being rented to students.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-203-66

Mr. Joseph E. Maurer, Jr. appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone a parcel at 4703 N. Grand River Avenue, from residential "A" one family (Non-conforming) to "F" commercial district. Mr. Maurer, stated that they intend to make

this dry cleaning, pick-up and drop-off store. There is a small building on the site which will be cleaned up. Feel there is plenty of parking for their purpose. The building is vacant and has been for about a year. They would like to remodel it.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-204-66

Mr. Arthur F. Frahm, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 1526 N. Logan Street, from "B" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district. Mr. Frahm advised that the property is facing Logan. It is fenced on the North, East and South boundaries. A natural pine fence is on the North and South borders. The residents in the area have voiced no objections and they would like to build a two story, 8 apartment building. Plot plans were presented. At the present time there is an apartment of rough appearance on the southwest corner of Logan and Ontario about 1 1/2 blocks from this site. North of the proposed building would allow for eleven parking spaces. A brick wall will hide the cars. There will be additional parking in the back.

Mr. Siebert, asked how many parking spaces were proposed, and was advised six or eight.

Mrs. Bretz, asked how much of the area would be built upon, and was advised 46 ft. x 65 ft.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-205-66

Mr. John S. Anthony, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone a parcel at 2224 N. Grand River Avenue, from "A" one family residential to "F" commercial. Mr. Anthony, advised that the property is being used for a flower shop. Mr. Anthony mentioned the commercial and industrial use in the area. They would like to take the house and the green house off as they are no longer used. This would give them much more room for parking. They may want to build on the back of the present building later. They do not like the non-conforming status because of insurance and other problems.

Mr. Siebert asked how much of the front is needed for their use, and was advised that it takes about 25 ft. in length and 75 ft. in width. He also mentioned that during the past five years they have improved the property. They do not want to take the house and greenhouse down until it is rezoned for commercial. The removals will improve the looks of the area.

Mr. Siebert asked where the access from

Grand River to the parking would be, and was informed that it would be on the West side, parking is to be where the green house is now located.

Mrs. Bretz asked if their trucks would load and unload in the back, and was advised that there is no outlet in the back. The removal of the house would eliminate backing into the traffic on Grand River, and would give a green strip in front by removing all parking.

Mr. Manz asked if there was parking in front of the building now, and was advised that there is but they can only park 3 or 4 automobiles. This will be removed, and the area sodded and curbed with the exit on the West.

Mr. Reynolds asked how much they anticipated enlarging the building, and was informed that it hasn't been measured. They would like to go back to where the double garage is now.

Mr. Reynolds remarked that the "J" parking district, may not be as objectionable as the commercial on the back end of the property. Some discussion followed on the advantages of submitting this information now and the parking area needed.

Mr. Anthony, added that this addition would be in keeping with the rest of the building.

Mrs. Bretz, asked Mr. Anthony to advise the Staff of the size of the proposed addition.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-206-66

Mr. William A. Maschke, representing the Walter Neller Company and Belen Flowers, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone a parcel at 403 S. Sycamore and 623 W. Kalamazoo Street, from "D" apartment to "E" apartment district. Mr. Maschke, stated that the subject property is across from Capitol Development, and that the state has purchased the petitioners property. They have been at their present site for 30 years and feel it is quite harmonious to the area. They intend to go into 623 when remodeled. The vacant lot on Kalamazoo St. is to be hard surfaced for parking. Employee parking would be behind 623, at 403 would be two-family. Egress would be off Sycamore and not off Kalamazoo. The only use of Kalamazoo St. would be for employee parking which would be behind the store.

Mr. Siebert, asked if there is a driveway on the property now, and was advised that it is a joint driveway between 623 and the property to the East.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-207-66

Mr. Hubert Will, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 3002 Turner Street, from "A" one family to "F" commercial district. Mr. Will stated that he operates a drug store. The entire building is all drug store now. He presented a sketch. He mentioned other retail establishments in the area. They wish to have apartments upstairs. This area was annexed about a year ago.

He feels it would be an asset to the area. He has improved the building during the past four years. There are very few apartments in this area.

Mr. Bretz asked if this is a new building, and was advised it is not. It is a one story cinder block, and they would like to build a second story over the first floor for a two bedroom apartment of about 1,000 feet and a one bedroom unit of about 750 feet. Approximately 250 feet of storage would be on the rear.

Mr. Gaus, asked the present building size, and was advised that it is 40 ft. x 55 ft. It is black topped on three sides for parking of customers. The porch may be extended 5 or 6 feet to the rear.

Mr. Reynolds, asked if they used this area now for off-street parking, and was advised that they did. The building is on the North. He has purchased the lot adjoining and has more area now than needed, and it is all black topped.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-84-66 and Z-157-66

Mrs. Kenneth Knostman, 3026 S. Cambridge Road appeared relative to the Mt. Hope property and presented a petition. She asked if the petition were turned down tonight, what would be the way to appeal? Mrs. Bretz, informed her that she should contact the Planning Committee of Council. Mrs. Knostman asked if the Board had seen the property, and was advised that the Board had.

Mr. Richard Benecke mentioned that the property had been purchased in 1965. They have worked with the Staff of the Board and other city departments and finally presented the site plans, and also data for a Community Unit Plan. This was submitted October 18th. Since that time it has not been acted upon. Strongly urged that action be taken on it. The parcel is approximately 22 acres or 5,000 lineal feet with 1320 feet facing Moores River Drive which will be a parkway. An additional 1200 feet will form a boundary with Elks Lodge, zoned commercial. An additional 420 feet abuts a trailer park. 1500 feet abuts single family on Cooley. Across the street is zoned for duplex, 1000 feet south another community unit plan under con-

struction. North of Mt. Hope another one under construction. He mentioned he thought the Board would be interested in this information. The southern part of the property was in commercial use when purchased.

Mr. Francis N. Fine recapped his previous testimony. He mentioned that another element has not harmed the area. His mortgagor would not be interested in mortgaging single family homes in this area. They plan a masonry fence adjacent to trailer park. The trailer park may not be able to expand. With apartments, there will be few children creating no impact on the schools. With the tax structure, a single family home does not return to the city what multiple family does. He mentioned that this type of structure will not make the trailer park vanish. They will not sell their property.

Mr. Lawrence McSherry, 3408 Inverary Drive stated that Lansing today does not have "A" residential sites. There are nice homes here. Feel this is "A" one. They have fought the trailer park for 20 years. It is a sore eye. Lansing has got to have "A" areas. Where is it providing that area? Westchester has no vacant lots. He mentioned the apartments in the area. For the future, feels it should be kept for residential homes.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Recess from 9:17 to 10:22 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

Mrs. Bretz, apologized to the people in the audience for not being able to act on the zoning matters before the Board. She explained that they were unable to obtain a quorum because of illness and work schedules. All zoning matters were postponed to the mid-month meeting, January 17th.

STREETS COMMITTEE

ROW-26-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that after considering the request from Dail Steel Products Company to vacate two alleys north of Main Street in the 900 Block of Hosmer and the 700 Block E. Main Street, that the portion of the alley South of the I-496 right-of-way, within Block 3, be vacated, the city to retain utility easements.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—5.

Nay: None.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that after considering the petition filed by residents of Delta River Drive objecting to the widening of the street that the pavement width on Delta River Drive be thirty-six ft. and that traffic controls (load limits, speed limits and diversion of traffic from West of Waverly Road to North Grand River) be placed on Delta River Drive to discourage through traffic and retain this drive as a residential collector to serve the immediate neighborhood.

Mr. Manz, stated that he felt that the 44 ft. would be justified. Traffic wouldn't warrant but it would allow parking. This will give all the driving capacity needed. There is no hardship as there is no parking on the street now.

Mrs. Bretz recommended that no heavy trucking be permitted.

Mr. Gaus, asked that his motions be changed to delete "load limits" and to include "trucking be prohibited." Mr. Manz seconded this change.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—5.

Nay: None.

BUILDING AND PROPERTIES

A full report on the recommendation for the State Capitol building will be given January 17th.

Mr. Reynolds mentioned that he had given this matter a great deal of thought, and with additions it would be as good a facility as if a new building were constructed.

Some discussion followed on the stature and dignity of the building.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds, stated that the Walter Neller Company desire to develop housing in the area. They propose a college town house type. They need some guidance on zoning on a Community Unit Plan. They would like some apartments above these stores. They have two problems. The new ordinance will allow no apartments above stores and they propose no parking for the 21 housing units above the stores. They will need about 20 odd parking spaces.

Some discussion followed on the parking needs.

Mr. Reynolds then explained that the area proposed for this development is North of Ionia, South of Shiawassee between Capitol and Washington.

Mr. Siebert mentioned problems in East Lansing regarding parking for apartments particularly those rented to students.

This matter is to be taken up at the January 17th meeting.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Alan E. Tubbs asked if it would be possible to have another member assigned to the Capital Improvements Committee, should Mr. Heino be unable to attend the meetings because of illness.

Mrs. Bretz, advised that in the case of Mr. Heino if he was unable to attend the meetings, Mr. Reynolds would act as chairman. Mr. Gaus, was appointed to the Committee as the fourth member.

Discussion was held on the date the project is due and the amount of work yet to be done.

Mr. Alan E. Tubbs, reviewed the scope of the Capital Improvements Program for the coming year.

A special meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 31st to discuss the Capital Improvements Program. The meeting will be held at 7:30 P.M. in the Planning Department office.

FINANCE

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus,

that \$900.00 be transferred from the salaries 170 110 account to the office expense account 170 301.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—5.

Nays: None.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Guernsey, informed the Board that the VII position is to be authorized by City Council. Mention was also made that some of the Staff members had received notices from their draft boards relative to reclassifications.

It was further mentioned that Mr. David Machtel, was leaving as the CRP coordinator, and that Mr. Martin Crampton would be acting coordinator.

Mr. Guernsey relayed that Mr. Black, who is ill and in the hospital, is expected to be recuperating the last half of the month. He will be on vacation the month of February.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

C/M

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Special Meeting, January 31, 1967

ROLL CALL

Present were: Heino, Reynolds, Manz, Bretz and Gaus—5.

Absent: Fink, Black and Siebert—3.

Chairman Bretz turned the meeting over to Mr. Heino, Chairman of the CHP Committee who in turn called on A. Tubbs to present the Department's proposals.

Mr. Tubbs asked if the Board was present the last time he talked about the bond issue program and the growth needs of the community for the next six years. Because the Board was aware of these needs, he wanted to go over the financial ability of the City to pay for these needed improvements; to review the 1967 Capital Budget as recommended to the Board by the Mayor's Capital Improvements Technical Coordinating Committee and lastly, to summarize the entire program. He mentioned the financial outlook report and tables submitted to the Board members prior to the meeting. He recalled that each of the Board members was aware of the inflation that has occurred in the past few years. Inflation plus the growth of the community have resulted in increased operating expenses for city government. This increase has been greater than the increase in total revenue available to city government. As a result, in the past six years funds available in the annual budget to finance Capital Improvements has decreased almost 45%.

Mr. Guernsey asked if this was actual cash and was advised that it was. In 1961 we were spending \$2,000,000 a year for Capital Improvements.

Mr. Reynolds asked whether or not these figures included debt service and was advised that it did not. Mr. Reynolds then asked if debt service was added to the above figures wouldn't this bring it up almost to where the other figures were in 1960? and was advised that it would still not reach this figure. Mr. Tubbs explained the tables that were presented to the Board.

Because of the current trend of having a smaller percentage of funds for Capital Improvements the city should consider developing some financial plan. Each year the same situation arises in terms of Capital

Improvements and we are faced with the same problems. It might be possible that a long range plan could be developed by the city and this plan could be based on a program of operating and maintenance expenditures for the public services; a Capital Improvements Program; and also a comprehensive revenue program. The three of these would be related to one another to serve as a guide so that each year we would know, how much money would be available for various categories.

Mr. Tubbs recalled in 1965 the Planning Board recommended a policy goal controlling operating expenses at 80% of the total budget. It is not realistic to expect the city to adopt the total 80% of the budget for Capital Improvements in debt service for one year.

An alternative to this approach is shown on Table 2. This approach recommends we adopt a policy of controlling operating expenses 80% of the total budget within six years. With this policy plus the \$10 million dollars bond issue, we will have approximately 17 million dollars between now and 1972.

The Mayor's C.I.P. Committee recommends six year program of 31 million, 2 hundred and 50 thousand dollars, as you notice, a recommended policy in the bond issue program will still result in approximate 5 million dollars short of the total recommended program. It is believed that by a class or a detailed re-examination of the program in the future years and by continuing study of other revenue sources it is very likely that the balance of this program can be financed. The ability of the city to provide funds for the Capital Improvements in the next six years depends on two things. One, is the adoption of the 10 million dollar bond issue, and the other is the adoption of a policy of controlling operating expenses. The only other alternative available from present revenue sources are to increase taxes to 25.2 mills per thousand with this increase set aside for capital improvements, two, to reduce the cost of city services approximately 2 million dollars per year, or a combination of the two.

Mr. Guernsey asked what the present tax was, and was advised that it is 19.95. The tax limitation based on the state equalization factor is 25.2.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the city could raise that much without a vote of the people, and was advised that the City Council could raise it up to 25 mills.

Mr. Tubbs then explained the 1967 Capital Budget Projects requested by the departments of the public service included under bridges the request for pedestrian overpasses. The original request was for three and was cut to two by the Mayor's Capital Improvement Committee.

Most of the street program under public service were to be done by the bond issue program, however, several projects such as the Oakland Avenue extension and various miscellaneous streets and trunkline improvements were to be financed through general revenue.

Mr. Reynolds asked why the Oakland Ave. project was not included in the bond issue? Mr. Tubbs stated that the above approved bond did not include all of the needs of the community. It only included projects that were very expensive, which the funds are needed immediately, or within a two year period, and those projects which we could not possibly set aside in our regular budget.

Included in the third section of the Public Service Department is the master sewer plan and public service motor pool. In the past years the city has spent considerable money on the beginning of a master sewer plan, however, last year this was not funded, and we feel this is essential if the extension of the facilities of the city are to be done in a logical and most efficient manner. This will, we hope, prevent any duplication of facilities.

Mr. Reynolds asked if this were a study and was advised that it is. The Planning Staff has submitted an overall density map for the City and on that basis the consulting firm had been in the process of drawing a master sewer plan to maintain the size of facilities needed, for given areas of the community.

Mr. Tubbs explained that the sanitary sewer portion of the total program is now funded from the sewerage fund, and in a general way we do not have to worry about those projects other than establishing priorities for them. Most of the storm sewer portion of the program was to be funded from the bond issue in 1967. A few exceptions were miscellaneous category for storm sewers petitioned which are small projects, which are difficult to define, and also are industrial plats.

Mr. Reynolds asked about the several public housing projects under storm sewers he was concerned about notation in the remarks of column which stated that one hundred thousand dollars would revert to unappropriated surplus in event the bond issue passed. Mr. Tubbs explained that we have prior years appropriations already funded of hundred thousand of the total cost of Public Housing sites, when the bond

issue passes this money will revert to unappropriated surplus to help pay back the debt service costs of the bond issue project.

There are eight projects on the bond issue, which are partially funded. In the event that the bond issue does pass these funds will revert to unappropriate surplus. A total of about \$700,000 will revert back to unappropriate surplus from partially funded projects.

Mr. Manz asked if the city share the cost of I-496? Mr. Manz was advised that as far as the Planning Staff knew that was the total cost.

The Parks and Recreation program for the 1967 budget year included the Red Cedar Basin Flood proposal, which the Board had acted upon about three months ago, and also numerous school and community park land acquisition, which in the past had recommended. A few projects included in the program such as the Grand Woods Day Camp, West Side Park bleachers, Sycamore Park baseball and rehabilitation of the Red Cedar Golf Course were recommended to be financed from general revenue. Two other projects recommended by the department were postponed one year. These were the River Walk on the Grand River and the golf service center.

In the case of the river walk, it was felt an alternative means of financing could be found.

Mr. Tubbs went on to explain the balance of the program and the recommendations.

Mr. Reynolds remarked that as far as he was concerned that 1967 Capital Budget was cut as much as could be, and still do whatever was necessary to be done. If possible, we should recommend this 80% control of operating expense if we can. It certainly would be a wonderful thing.

Mrs. Bretz stated that before she would approve of spending any money on the airport, something should be done about the parking.

Mr. Guernsey commented that the City of Lansing has only the responsibility for the road to the airport. The City has no control of the parking or keeping of the grounds. The only area that we have any responsibility is the building itself.

Mr. Tubbs stated the only one good thing about the parking was the people who are using the airport facility and are maintaining it and paying for it. Loss of this revenue might mean the city would have to subsidize the operation.

Mrs. Bretz stated that she was talking about the meters out in front where the drop offs place at the airport terminal. She stated that the rate charged at these meters were such that you couldn't put enough money in to put a person on a plane. This establishes a very poor public relations concerning the airport.

Mr. Tubbs went on to review the summary sheet for the six year program.

Motion by Heino, seconded by Reynolds that the Capital Improvements Program as outlined be approved and also would like to recommend that the policy recommending control of operating expense at 80% of the total budget within six years be adopted and that the city develop a long term financial plan in order to meet its budget commitments in the future and that the city undertake a detailed traffic study in the central city before funds are spent for major projects within this area.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Guernsey advised that the \$5,000 request in the part time account would cover the salaries of one part time person who has been on this basis for quite some time and the necessity of a revision of a land use for the entire city which would take about five students to examine the use of each structure within the city.

Other items in the budget were explained.

Some discussion was held on the type of new files and the new office layout.

Motion by Gaus seconded by Heino the budget of \$129,954.75 be forwarded to City Council as amended.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Planning Director proposed and elaborated on the departmental budget for the next fiscal year beginning July 1, 1967.

Staff excused for 10 minutes.

Motion by Gaus that the salary of the Planning Director be increased to \$15,000.

Some discussion followed about the State Capitol.

Meeting adjourned.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, February 7, 1967

The February 7, 1967 meeting of the Housing Commission was called to order by President Oliver at 1:43 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Blackall, Clapp, Oliver, Owen—4.

Absent: Commissioner Patterson—1.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were approved as printed.

COMMUNICATIONS

1. Letter from Community Services Council pertaining to Brotherhood Program. Read and discussed.
2. Letter from Michigan Welfare League pertaining to Organizational Membership.

3. Copy of letter from Mr. Stanley Levin (Community Services Council) to Mayor and Council regarding possible delay in Senior Citizen Apartment Building. Read and discussed.
4. Copy of Resolution from Economic Opportunity Committee concerning Low-Rent Housing. Read and discussed.
5. Communication from City Attorney concerning Leases with State.
6. Communication from City Attorney suggesting amendments to Housing Ordinance.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

1. Plans of Project 53-5 shown. Community building and office space discussed in detail. Public hearing of Project to be held February 21, 1967.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, January 17, 1967

Meeting called to order at 7:38 P.M. by Chairman Ramona Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz and Siebert—6.

Absent: Black and Reynolds—2.

HEARINGS

S-1-63 Forest Park Subdivision

Mr. D. Gregory Main, Planner, pointed out the location, land use, and proposed development of the property.

Mr. Lavern Hendryk, Engineer for the Plat, briefly discussed the proposed plat.

Mr. Howard Kussmaul, proprietor of the land was introduced to the Board.

Mr. Guernsey asked if sewer was being installed, and was advised that it is in.

Mr. Fink asked if it were storm and sanitary? Mr. Hendryk replied that it was sanitary. He didn't believe there was storm in at this time.

Mr. Fink, then asked if this is a requirement of the subdivider. Mr. Guernsey answered that the engineer and the Public Service Department would have to work out plans for the sewers and this would be handled before a final plat could be approved.

Mr. Fink asked if this would be part of Capital Improvements Program and was advised that it would be for the area along Forest Road.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

Mr. Reynolds came in at 7:45 P.M.

S-19-66 Assessors Plat No. 57

Mr. D. Gregory Main, discussed the loca-

tion and the purpose of the platting of this land.

Mr. Gerald Ernst, City Assessor, added that the lots now in metes and bounds descriptions and this legal could, when platting be changed to a simple lot number.

Mr. Guernsey mentioned the questions received in the Planning office, and asked Mr. Ernst if he would answer these which answered this with a "No", this would seemed to cause the most concern? Would this have any effect on taxation? Mr. Ernst merely facilitate the administration in the Assessor's office.

Would this be a zoning change or a change in the use? The answer to this was "No".

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

S-20-66 Mid State Replat of Assessors Plat No. 18

Mr. D. Gregory Main discussed the plat, mentioned the present use and how the property would be divided.

Mr. Manz asked why one lot, where the existing "I" shaped apartment building is was not included in this plat, and it was mentioned this is in a separate ownership from the proposed replatted lots.

Mr. Main explained that this is not an Assessor's Plat, but one filed by a separate individual.

Mr. Fink asked the density of the apartment on the land now, and was advised that it was believed one building had 17 apartments, another 19 and the third one was unknown. The land area is about 3 acres.

Mr. Dan Smith of Mid State Builders, stated that the purpose of this is to put the land into lots. This will not change the density or use requirements on it.

Mr. Fink asked if the vacant land would permit additional development on the site, and was advised that it would, as it is zoned for "D-M" multiple. Mr. Fink then asked how many units are on the lot and

was advised ten units which meet requirements.

Mr. Michael E. Beyer of 407 Clifford, wanted to know when this was zoned "D-M"? He had lived there since 1959 and was unaware that it was zoned "D-M". Mr. Beyer was informed that property was rezoned in the 1950's.

Mr. Dennis Waltz, 411 Clifford mentioned he had owned his house since 1957 and didn't think he was notified of the change. Mr. Guernsey advised him that notification was by newspaper publication and by the posting of the property.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

Z-157-66

Mr. Bob Krue of the firm of Beneicke and Krue presented a drawing on the previous presentation of the property asked for rezoning located on Moores River Drive. He briefly stated the uses in the surrounding area and the structures being built. He added further that part of the property they wished to develop was an archery range which is sort of a commercial use.

Z-184-66

Mr. Kendall Lovell presented a petition he claimed had 155 signatures on it in opposition to the rezoning. He stated that all the owners in this area object. Mention was made of other zoning requests in the area they refused and added that they hope to get this one refused also.

Mr. Wilbur Youngquist of 5011 Connors Avenue stated he objected to the rezoning. The street would stick out like a sore thumb. This would add to the congestion of traffic. The schools are crowded and the children have to attend portable classrooms.

Mrs. Gordon Wilson stated that her property is next to the proposed change. She mentioned the lot is long and narrow. There are all small houses on small lots and she wanted to add her objections.

Z-84-66 and Z-157-66

Mr. Merle Barnhart, 3500 Christine Drive stated he was not in favor of Beneicke and Krue's or Francis Fine's multiple developments. He felt land was needed for private houses, parks and recreation. He added some further comments that he felt the city might be hampering the Board of Education efforts to provide schools when properties are rezoned for multiple dwellings. He is not opposed to the multiple dwelling as such, for in most cases they are well done, but feel that they have taken there share in the area. It would multiply

problems of traffic, which the city might not be able to handle, schools will not be adequate and they will need additional funds. Doubling and tripling the population is turning ourselves around backwards.

Z-187-66

Mr. Mike Beyer wondered what was going to be done about this rezoning. He stated he understood it was non-conforming. He would like it to stay non-conforming. Recommended that the request be turned down.

Mr. Dennis Waltz, 411 Clifford asked if a petition would help to get this request turned down?

Mr. Siebert advised that this matter is on the agenda for consideration after recess.

Recess 8:07 to 8:35.

SS-29-66 Amendment to the Subdivision Regulations

Mr. James A. Church, Planner, gave an explanation of the proposed amendments and advised that it will mean a standardization of the street and road widths in the Tri-County Area. He further explained the proposed names of the type of roadways and their widths.

Mr. Manz, mentioned that one local street was 44 ft. He stated he thought we should stick to a minimum of 12 ft. lanes. He mentioned the present problems on Logan St. 44 feet doesn't seem adequate for a four lane collector street.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

SS-23-66 Amendment to the Subdivision Regulations

Mr. James A. Church explained that the minimum lot width amendment should be 60 ft. He further informed that the city is now guided by the State Plat Act. He presented a sketch and explained the proposed change.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Manz, seconded by Gaus that the minutes of November 22, December 6, 20, and January 3rd be approved.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

S-9-63 Virginia Villiage

Public hearing on the preliminary Plat was set for Tuesday, February 21, 1967 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1, 6th Floor of City Hall.

S-1-67 Fairhaven Subdivision

Public hearing on the preliminary Plat was set for Tuesday, February 21, 1967 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1, 6th Floor of City Hall.

Z-188-66

Public hearing on the petition by Thayer and Homer Winegardner and H. Burdette Bottom, for the rezoning of a parcel in the 1800 and 1900 Blocks of Hoyt Street, (between Aurelius and Ruth St.) described as:

Lots 36, 37, 38, 61, 62, 63 of Good-homes Subdivision, City of Lansing

from "A" residential to "D-M" multiple revised to Community Unit Plan was set for Tuesday, February 7, 1967 in Court Room No. 1, 6th Floor of City Hall at 7:30 P.M.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-84-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Francis N. Fine, to rezone a parcel at 3313 W. Mt. Hope Avenue, from "A" one family residence to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied.

Denial of the request would preserve the prime single family characteristics of this area of the city.

This will give the citizens of Lansing in four residential neighborhoods security of their single family development.

Increased density reduces the prime economic value of the single family development, through the increase of traffic and activity.

The vacant land in this area consists of approximately 80 acres which should be retained for single family development.

The street pattern for the suggested overall area should be designed in such a manner that it would enhance the quality of single family residential development.

The Board believes a suggested overall development plan would be compatible with development in the area.

The proposed single family development limits the access on Moores River Drive.

Development of the entire area (approximately 80 acres) at 12 units per acre would allow approximately 1,000 dwelling units, whereas, single family development would be limited to approximately 200 single family homes.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area low density residential (2-3 dwelling units per net acre.)

In developing the Master Plan the overall urban and urbanized area was first divided into "Communities" which could be identified as recognized physical entities. The "Community" is primarily residential in character, but has within it a full complement of facilities for shopping, social, civic and religious activities, and for education and recreation.

If the subject property were allowed to develop in apartment use it would be difficult to apply single family controls to the balance of vacant land adjacent to these developments.

Mr. D. Gregory Main, presented and explained the proposed overall development plan for the area.

Mr. Siebert added that the drawing of the overall development plan is just a suggestion and is not a recommendation.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-157-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Richard P. Benecke and F. Robert Krue, to rezone a parcel at 3535 Moores River Drive, from single family to Community Unit Plan be denied.

Denial of the request would preserve the prime single family characteristics of this area of the city.

This would give the citizens of Lansing four residential neighborhoods security of their single family development.

Increased density reduces the prime economic value of the single family development, through the increase of traffic and activity.

The vacant land in this area consists of approximately 80 acres which should be retained for single family development.

The street pattern for the suggested overall area should be designed in such a manner that it would enhance the quality of single family residential development.

The Board believes a suggested overall de-

velopment plan would be compatible with development in the area.

The proposed single family development limits the access on Moores River Drive.

Development of the entire area (approximately) 80 acres at 12 units per acres would allow approximately 1,00 dwelling units, whereas single family development would be limited to approximately 200 single family homes.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as low density residential (2-3 dwelling units per net acre).

In developing the Master Plan the overall urban and urbanized area was first divided into "Communities" which could be identified as recognized physical entities. The "Community" is primarily residential in character, but has within it a full complement of facilities for shopping, social, civic and religious activities, and for education and recreation.

If the subject property were allowed to develop in apartment use it would be difficult to apply single family controls to the balance of vacant land adjacent to these developments.

Mr. D. Gregory Main presented and explained the proposed overall development plan for this area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-164-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Marvin H. and Doris C. Moore and Joe D. Pentecost, to rezone a parcel at 4312 Collins Road, described as:

Beginning on the E. W. $\frac{1}{4}$ line of Section 36, T4N, R2W, S. 89 deg. 46' 59" W. 37.62 feet from the N.E. corner of the W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of said Section 36; thence continuing S. 89 deg. 46' 59" W. 445.10 feet to the I-496 Limited Access Right-of-Way; thence along the right-of-way for I-496, Dunckel Road, and Collins Road S. 4 deg. 39' 20" W. 42.22 feet; S. 40 deg. 45' 47" E. 210.65 feet; S. 86 deg. 09' 45" E. 185.37 feet; N. 47 deg. 24' 45" E. 174.71 feet; and N. 1 deg. 31' 45" W. 97.5 feet to point of beginning

from residential to "F" commercial district be denied as filed, and that part of the parcel described as:

Beginning at a point on the E.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ line of Section 36, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

that is South 89 deg. 46' 59" West 317.62 feet from the Northeast corner of the West $\frac{1}{2}$ of the S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of said Section 36; thence continuing along the E.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ line South 89 deg. 46' 59" West a distance of 165.10 feet to a point on the Easterly Limited Access Right-of-Way line of I-496 Highway; thence along said Limited Access Right-of-Way Line South 04 deg. 39' 20" West 42.22 feet and South 40 deg. 45' 47" East 210.65 feet; thence North 03 deg. 50' 15" East a distance of 12 feet; thence North 21 deg. 16' 00" East a distance of 80 feet; thence North 01 deg. 31' 45" West 115 feet to the point of beginning

be rezoned from "A" one family residence to "D-1" professional office district, and that part of the parcel described as:

From the Northeast corner of the West $\frac{1}{2}$ of the S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 36, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, South 89 deg. 46' 59" West 37.62 feet along the E.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ line and South 01 deg. 31' 45" East 57.3 feet for a point of beginning; thence South 89 deg. 46' 59" West 280 feet parallel with the E.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ line; thence South 01 deg. 31' 45" East 57.7 feet; thence South 21 deg. 16' 00" West 80 feet; thence South 03 deg. 50' 15" West 12 feet to the North line of Dunckel Road; thence along the North line of Dunckel Road South 86 deg. 09' 45" East 185.37 feet; thence North 47 deg. 24' 45" East 174.71 feet; thence North 01 deg. 31' 45" West 40.2 feet to the point of beginning

be rezoned from "A" one family to "E-2" drive-in, and that the remainder of the parcel remain in "A" one family residential, and further that:

The land be platted and given final approval before building permits are issued.

The developer should pay his share for the extension of public utilities to serve the area.

The site is isolated by Consumers Power Company ROW to the North and major streets on all sides, making it reasonable to assume that the property would not develop as part of an overall plan with the adjacent areas.

Motion carried by the following votes:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-176-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Alvin L. Pickett, to

rezone a parcel at 2020 William Street, from "B" one family residence to "C" two family residence district be granted.

This meets the physical characteristics for "C" two family zoning.

Motion carried by the following votes:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-180-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the petition by Marvin DeWald, to rezone a parcel at 4806 S. Logan Street from "A" residential to "F" commercial district be tabled for further study to allow the Staff time to discuss with the petitioner.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-183-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Leo A. Farhat, Attorney, acting for Caso Nova Inc., to rezone a parcel at 1117 Goodrich from "B" one family residence to "J" parking district be denied.

Change of zoning on the subject property would allow further penetration of a commercial development into a present single family residential area.

The change will adversely affect living conditions in the immediate area, principally through the increase of traffic and activity.

The problems of further encroachment into the residential area to the West were recognized when rezoning of the commercial development was granted by the City Council October 6, 1958. One of the conditions was as follows:

That the driveway approach on Goodrich Street veer to the right in the direction of Logan Street, and that a metal barrier along the west side of said driveway, between the curb and sidewalk, be erected. That in addition, a louvered redwood fence be erected on the west side of said property suitable in height to screen the parking lot from the residential area, and that, along Goodrich Street, a dense evergreen hedge, which shall reach a mature height, suitable to screen the parking area from the residential neighborhood, be planted.

The re-construction and widening of Logan Street from Victor Avenue north to I-496 is scheduled for the very near future.

In discussions with the State Highway Department it was found that the State plans to acquire this commercial establishment and the existing off-street parking. If more land were rezoned and developed for this site it is very possible the State would be obligated to purchase the additional land, which would be a misuse of tax dollars. This is especially true when steps can be taken to discourage the proposed development at this time.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-184-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the petition by Warner & Long Development Co., Inc. to rezone a parcel at 3328 W. Jolly Road from "A" residential to "D-M" multiple be tabled to February 7th pending an opinion regarding deed restrictions that would limit development of the property as per attorney for owner.

Mr. Siebert, asked if the director had contacted the City Attorney for an opinion, and Mr. Guernsey advised that the attorney for the petitioner had written the City Attorney for an opinion, and Mr. Guernsey advised that the attorney for the petitioner had written the City Attorney and as far as now known, a reply has not been received. Mr. Guernsey added that the Board could act on this rezoning as the deed restrictions might be a separate matter.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-185-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Frank M. Kropschot, President, of the Bank of Lansing, to rezone a parcel in the 5100 and 5200 block S. Cedar Street, described as:

That part of the N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 4, T3N, R2W, desc. as beginning on the W. line of Cedar Street, 713 feet S. of the N. line of Section 4, T3N, R2W, thence S. 150 feet on the W. line of Cedar Street; thence W. 200 feet; thence N. 150 feet; thence E. 200 feet to the point of beginning, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from Parking and Commercial to Parking and Commercial district, be denied as filed and that

Comm. 70 ft. West and 20 ft. North of the S.E. corner of the subject property, thence West 90 ft., thence North

55 ft., thence East 90 ft., thence South 55 ft. to beginning

be zoned "F" commercial, and

The balance of the property

be zoned "J" parking.

The Board further recommends that before any future zoning requests are considered within this commercial complex, the developer be required to submit an overall development reflecting the existing development and proposed development for the entire center. This would insure that adequate set-back, off-street parking and traffic flow relating to the site are complied with.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates commercial development at this location.

The applicant agrees to increase the building set-back from the original proposed 25 ft. to 75 ft.

The shopping center complex consist of approximately 10 acres, and is considered as a sub-community shopping center in the Master Land Use Plan. The desirable number of stores is from 10-20, including a branch bank.

Mr. Fountain mentioned that new plans have been submitted.

Mr. Reynolds asked how much projection would there be in front of the shopping center, and was advised about 50 feet.

Some discussion followed on the traffic flow and the number of cars.

Mr. Guernsey mentioned that it was a pleasure to work with the developer, and that this is one of the best lay outs that would be obtained on this area and it is one of the best for this type of development in the city. This meets the general plan approved some months ago.

Mr. Fink asked the size of the building, and was advised it would be 2800 square feet or 40 ft. x 70 ft. The original dimensions were less than 2,000.

Z-186-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by David T. Phillips, to rezone a parcel at 3435 West Holmes Road, from "A" one family to "D" apartment district be denied, and that the petitioner be encouraged to develop in conformance with the approved preliminary plat for this site.

The development as proposed by the petitioner would generate, according to recent studies, approximately 580 vehicle trips per day as opposed to 93 vehicle trips if developed under existing zoning.

The development of this site as proposed by the petitioner would necessitate a plat with public streets which would not be compatible with the existing residential streets and would create high traffic volumes on these residential streets.

The site does not meet any of the criteria for apartment zoning.

Existing utilities were designed for low density single family development and are presently over capacity. This development would aggravate the problem.

This site was included in a Preliminary Plat for the area which was approved by the Planning Board on March 3, 1960. The owner participated in development of the plan.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-187-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Robert Harper, to rezone a parcel in the 328 Lathrop and 1411 E. Kalamazoo, described as:

Lot 29 Harrak's Addition E. 55 ft. of Lot 30, Harrak's Add.

from "C" two family to "F" commercial and "J" parking district be denied.

The requested change of zoning would lead to further strip commercial along this area of Kalamazoo Street.

The existing non-conforming commercial building on the site does not comply to the required yard set-backs.

Because of the street alignment and grade, sight distance for through traffic is reduced in this area.

The city should consider this an opportunity for clearance of a nonconforming, blighting, influence on the neighborhood with monies provided for under the Capital Improvement Program. This authority is authorized under Section 125.583 A of the (Mich.) City and Village Zoning Act, Act 207 of Public Acts of 1921.

Mr. Fink, asked the following to be included:

The Board believes that this is an excellent opportunity for this type of neighborhood renewal on this local level, as it is an element of concern.

Mr. Guernsey, mentioned the proposal of the Planning Board to set aside funds

for the purchase of blighted buildings and asked if this was the Board's intent.

Mr. Reynolds wondered if this would be part of the CRP and asked if this wasn't one of the proposals.

Mr. Fink suggested that the ordinance be revised.

Some discussion followed on the millage proposed.

Z-189-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by G. W. Van Houten, to rezone a parcel at 2400 E. Kalamazoo Street, from "B" one family residence to "F" commercial district be denied as filed, and the property be zoned "C" two family. This would encourage development in keeping with the residential development to the north and west, and discourage further strip commercial development along Kalamazoo Street.

Commercial zoning at this location would allow uses that would affect living conditions in the residential area principally through the increase of traffic and activity.

The property on the northwest corner of Kalamazoo Street and Foster Avenue was recommended for denial November 3, 1965 for the following reasons:

The granting of this request could lead to further request of a commercial nature which would be detrimental to the residential development and the park.

Commercial uses adjacent to residential uses is detrimental to both.

Residential areas should be protected against the encroachment of commercial uses.

City Council concurred January 17, 1966.

Mr. Gaus asked if the Board wanted to retain the residential nature, why did they rezone this to "C" two family? Mr. Heino, advised that this is next door to a pizza type restaurant and it was the general feeling that it would be impossible to develop this into single family, and the two family would act as a buffer to the single family homes.

Further discussions were held on whether or not the Board had recommended in favor of rezonings in the area that had been granted.

Z-190-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Kenneth W. Weaver,

to rezone a parcel in the 300 Block of Fenton Street, described as:

Lots 85 and 86 Jessop Home Gardens Subdivision

from "A" one family residence to "C" two family district be granted.

The heights of dwelling proposed for the sites would not be completely out of character with development in the area.

The lots have more than adequate land area for the proposed use.

Mr. Fink asked if the committee had seen the site plan and if the Board might like to add a statement that the trees on the property remain between the two lots to retain the aesthetic values if humanly possible.

Mr. Siebert advised that the Zoning Committee had seen the plans and the petitioner had stated he would leave the trees.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-191-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Paul V. Spagnuolo, to rezone a parcel in the 5200 block S. Logan Street described as:

North 26.7 ft. of Lot 46 Supervisors Plat of Prosperity Farms,

from "J" parking to "F" commercial

East 50 ft. of Lot 17 Supervisors Plat of Balzer Subdivision,

from "A" one family to "F" commercial

W. 75 ft. of the 125 ft. of Lot 17 of Balzers Subdivision.

from "A" one family to "J" parking

That portion of Lot 18 included in the following described property:

Comm. at the S.W. corner of Lot 14, Supervisors Plat of Balzer Subdivision thence N.E. to the N.E. corner of Lot 13, thence W. 150 ft. to the N.W. corner of Lot 14, thence S. along the W. line of Lot 14, to begining,

from "J" parking to "E" commercial, all above described property within the City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, be denied as filed, and that

All that part of Lot 18 of Balzers Sub-

division which lies Northwesterly of a line described as:

Beginning at the Southwest corner of Lot 14 thence Northeasterly to the Northeast corner of Lot 13

and

The Easterly 50 feet of Lot 17 of Balzers Subdivision;

and

That part of the North 26.7 feet of Lot 46 of Supervisor's Plat of Prosperity Farms which lies West of a line 60 feet West of and parallel to the West line of Logan Street

be zoned "F" commercial, and further recommends that the

West 75 feet of the East 125 feet of Lot 17 of Balzers Subdivision,

and

All that part of Lot 13, Balzers Subdivision, and those parts of Lots 45 and 46 of Supervisor's Plat of Prosperity Farms which lies Southeasterly of a line 60 feet Northwesterly of and parallel to the Northwesterly line of Logan Street

be zoned "J" parking with screening along a line described as:

Beginning at the Northwest corner of Lot 14 of Balzer's Subdivision; thence East 25 feet thence North 66 feet; thence East 125 feet to the point of ending.

Screening to consist of one of the following:

A dense privet hedge of a mature height of 5 feet.

A 3 foot high chain link fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 5 ft. to 5 ft. 6 in.

A 5 foot high chain link fence with interwoven redwood slats.

Screening consistent with the existing screening (redwood fence) or any other screening as may be suggested by the petitioner with the approval of the Planning Board.

The site is being developed generally within the guidelines established by the Master Plan.

The additional zoning will allow full development of the site.

Mr. Guas, asked what the property to the North is zoned commercial or is it non-conforming, and was advised that we recently received a request for rezoning.

Mr. Fink mentioned that some of these were developed while in the township and built almost to the curb line. The corner may be hard to convert back to a conforming use.

Mr. Siebert advised that the Committee felt that the garden center setback was about right. Most the zoning is non-conforming.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-192-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the petition by Jack Tysman to rezone a parcel at 3206 Aurelius Road from "A" one family to Community Unit Plan be tabled pending an overall development plan for the area.

Mr. Guernsey, added that the developer is working very closely with the Staff, and they will try to get a recommendation to the zoning committee for the next meeting. Sewer lines are being installed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-193-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the petition by Cambridge Development Co., Robert E. Savage, to rezone a parcel in the 2800 and 2900 blocks of Averill Drive, described as:

Lots 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 180, 181, 182, 197, and 198 Scottdale Subdivision No. 2

from "A" one family to "C" two family residence district be tabled to February 7th for further study and discussion with the Staff.

Motion carried by a 6 yea, 1 nay vote.

Z-194-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Jack Dykstra Ford, Inc., to rezone a parcel in the 1200 block of W. Holmes Road, described as:

Commencing on the North section line of Section 32, T4N, R2W, Ingham County, Michigan, 246.34 feet West of

the North $\frac{1}{8}$ Post of the N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ corner of said Section 32, thence South 322 feet, thence West 200 feet, thence North 322 feet to the North section line, thence East 200 feet to the point of beginning

from "J" parking to "F" commercial district be denied as filed, and that the

North 70 ft. except the South 10 ft. of the North 43 ft. of the East 10 ft. thereof, and the West 20 ft. of the property

remain "J" parking and,

The balance of the property

be rezoned from "J" parking to "F" commercial, with screening along the West line of the "J" district, except for the North 70 ft.

Screening to consist of one of the following:

A dense privet hedge of 5 ft. in height.

A 5 ft. high chain link fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 5 ft. to 5 ft. 6 in.

A 5 ft. high decorative masonry wall, or

Any other type of screening that may be proposed by the developer, with the approval of the Planning Department.

This site was considered by the Planning Board, April 8, 1965 when the zoning was changed to permit the development of the new car sales office to the south. The property owners did not show any proposed use of this land at that time and a "J" parking zone was recommended, which permitted the storage of vehicles. The request at this time will not effectively change the existing use, but will permit the erection of a small sales office, and the sale of vehicles from the site. Zoning of the entire site would not insure proper set-backs from Holmes Road and the residential to the West, therefore the Board makes the above recommendation.

Mr. Siebert requested the location of the sign and was advised it would be placed in the N.E. corner.

Some discussion followed on how much of an area would be needed for the sign. Mr. Fountain reminded the Board that the sign would not be allowed to overhang the right-of-way.

Mr. Horace J. Bradshaw, Councilman, asked the chair if he could be heard, and was granted permission.

Mr. Bradshaw stated that the petitioner is interested in putting the sign as close to the gas station as possible. He feels sure that they will cooperate with the city. It cannot extend into the public right-of-way. The sign will be similar to the one

on Logan which is the standard Ford sign.

Mr. Fink asked for a clarification on the public right-of-way.

Mr. Fountain advised that it is 33 ft. now, and proposed for 50-60 ft. from centerline.

Mr. Gaus asked, inasmuch, as we have nothing on the use other than as proposed, can they build? He was advised he must move back his present sales area.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the 10 x 10 would be acceptable? Some further comments were made that publicity of poor planning always shows signs protruding into highways.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-195-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Mark M. Spagnuolo, to rezone a parcel in the 401 W. Ionia and 225-27 N. Walnut, from "D-M" multiple and "D" apartment to "D-1" professional district be granted.

The Central City Development Plan indicates proposed use of this area for offices and services.

Development of offices within this proposed office-service area will discourage further scatterization of this type of use through areas proposed for low density residential, state offices and high rise apartment development.

Professional office zoning requires off-street parking with the development of offices.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-196-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the Community Unit Plan by Francis N. Fine, for a parcel at Pleasant Grove and Reo Road, described as:

S. 12 acres of the S. 30 acres of N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 31, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, except the E. 190 ft.

be approved subject to the following conditions:

That 33 feet from the property line be dedicated for street right-of-way for Reo Road, as shown on the site plan.

The installation of a 10 in. water main when the north one-half of Reo Road ROW is dedicated as a public street from the western boundary to Pleasant Grove Road.

Buildings must be so located that the furthest part of any building is no more than 200 feet from the nearest drive or street.

Screening of one of the following types be constructed along the east and west property lines:

Evergreen shrubs having a mature height of not less than 5 feet.

Three or four foot high cyclone type fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 4 feet.

A five ft. high decorative masonry wall.

The building and general arrangement be essentially as shown on the site plan.

That each parking space be a minimum of 9 by 20 feet.

The plan is valid for a period of one year from the date of City Council approval.

The plan proposes 100 living units on 9.4 acres for a gross density of 10.6 dwelling units per acre. The dwelling units will consist of the following:

20—1 bedroom

24—2 bedrooms

35—3 bedrooms

14—4 bedrooms

7—5 bedrooms

(

Parking will be provided at a ratio of 1.5 stalls per dwelling unit or a total of 150 spaces.

The project would be built under the "turn key" program, that is, the developer obtains the site, finances the project and builds it according to federally approved specifications. Upon completion, the city would buy the site and become owner and manager for the low rent housing project.

Following a period of study by the Planning Staff and a Public Hearing held on December 20, 1966 it was found that:

The property adjacent to the area will not be adversely affected. The density for the area will remain about the same by the creation of the 18 acre park site as

compared to the land being developed single family.

The plan is consistent with the intent and purpose of promoting the public health, safety, morals and general welfare. The project will be built to federally approved specifications, and upon completion to be managed by the Lansing City Housing Commission.

The buildings and structures shall be used only for multiple dwellings and the usual accessory uses such as parking, storage space, etc. The plan as approved, indicates the uses proposed for this development, these are in keeping with Section 36-7 of the Zoning Code.

The Board further recommends that acreage on the east end of the park site be explored as a school site, and discussions with the school board for a temporary building, primarily to serve the younger school children in the immediate vicinity.

The project will fulfill an acute shortage in the low rent housing market and provide shelter for families being displaced by freeway construction.

The site is located adjacent to a proposed park, which can satisfy active and passive recreational needs.

It is near a major arterial providing proper access for fire, police and other services.

Bus service is available on Pleasant Grove Rd.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nay: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

ROW-28-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Perrin that the Board recommend to City Council that after considering the letter from Friedland Iron and Metal Company requesting the vacation of a portion of the 300 Blk. Water Street beginning at the east side of Factory Street and extending east to Center Street, that the request be disapproved at this time.

The portion of Factory St. requested for vacation has an 83 ft. width and extends 181 ft. from the east right-of-way line of Factory St. to the west right-of-way line of Center Street and comprises 15,023 sq. ft.

This area has been under consideration as a possible urban renewal area. A proposed extension of Turner Street, south of E. Grand River to Oakland Avenue, would cross Water Street in the vicinity of the

proposed vacation, and at that time could be needed for traffic circulation.

The Public Service Board recommended against this requested vacation and the Director states in his recommendation to the Planning Board:

"Due to existing and possible future sewer requirements and possible inclusion in an urban renewal area, we do not recommend vacating at this time."

The Friedland Iron and Metal Company has had the use of this street in the past and we know no reason why they cannot continue to use it until such time as the City develops it as a street, or it is incorporated in a future urban renewal project. If the City were to vacate this street at this time, it could find itself in the position of purchasing it back at a later date. For these reasons it would not be advisable to vacate this street at this time.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

S-8-66F South Penn. Concourse No. 2

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that City Council be advised that they approved the Final Plat of South Penn. Concourse No. 2 and recommend that it be approved by City Council subject to the following conditions:

All public improvements shall be installed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewers, storm sewers, and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks and such other improvements as required under Section VI D of Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

The posting of financial security in the amount of:

Monuments	\$120.00
Curb and Gutter	230.00
Storm Sewer	500.00
Total	\$850.00

prior to the signing and affixing of municipal seal.

Certification of agreement for water and electric service by the Board of Water and Light.

All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Act of 1929 as amended shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

S-15-66P Sunset Hills No. 6

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that Mr. George Byrnes, the developer, be notified that the Preliminary Plat of Sunset Hills No. 6 was approved subject to the following conditions:

Final plat to be developed with public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

Construction and improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior to approval of the final plat.

Street right-of-way should be 66 feet with 36 foot pavement.

All lots should be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.

Outlot B of Sunset Hills No. 4 should be included as part of Lot 198 as shown on the preliminary plat.

This approval shall expire January 17, 1968.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

S-17-66P Eppic Acres

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that Mr. Jack Tysman, the developer, be notified that the Preliminary Plat of Eppic Acres was approved subject to the following conditions:

Final plat to be developed with public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

Construction and improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior to approval of the final plat. (Public Service Department).

Street right-of-way should be 66 feet with 36 foot pavement. A right-of-way dedication of 50 feet west of the east line of Section 27 of Aurelius Road should be provided.

A plat restriction prohibiting access from residential lots to Aurelius should appear on the face of the final plat.

All lots should be graded so that storm water shall drain therefrom.

This approval shall expire January 3, 1968.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

BUILDINGS AND PROPERTIES

The Secretary advised that Mr. Black had submitted a letter relative to his feelings on the State Capitol building. Copies of the letter were distributed to the Board.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds advised that the contract had been let for the demolition of the Weger Building. By early spring there should be a number of buildings down for more parking area.

Mr. Fink, asked about the total property that had been acquired. Mr. Reynolds advised that it is about 75% acquired, but it is spotted. Mr. Reynolds, then mentioned some of the areas where only one or two parcels are yet to be acquired. He further mentioned that they had inquiries from interested parties for developments, but were held up because they were unable to acquire the entire blocks.

Mr. Guernsey, added that a crucial situation is developing because of these delays.

PLANNING DIRECTOR

ROW-27-66

Mr. Guernsey, explained to the Board difficulties regarding their recommendation to City Council, concerning load limits.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that the recommendation be corrected to have the sign installed and worded "Trucks be prohibited, delivery trucks only."

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The budget for the 1967-68 fiscal year will be brought up and discussed at the Special Meeting on January 31st.

After some discussion it was decided that the joint meeting with the Traffic Board and the Planning Board should be held on March 14th, at 7:30 P.M.

OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The letter from the Chamber of Commerce relative to the slide presentation "The Greater Lansing Progress Story" was read and discussed.

The progress report of the R. L. Polk Census of tabulation and the data processing were given. The Staff are working with them to make it an operating process.

Letter from the Board of Realtors, relative to working relationships was read. The Secretary mentioned meetings held with the Board and of the items they had supported.

The Community Services Council 1967 Brotherhood dinner will be held on Thursday, February 23rd. The Human Relations banquet will be held February 4th.

NEW BUSINESS

A communication relative to the joint MSPO-AIP Committee for State Legislation was read.

Mr. Reynolds remarked on the State Planning Commission, that he thought there were too many steps.

Some discussion was held on the varied duties of the County and Tri-County.

Mr. Fink advised he would like a copy of the guide line.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

is pending a visit in cooperation with the Michigan Department of Health.

Mr. Pesterfield reports he can find no cause for complaint regarding Sportsman's Bar and recommends that the complaint be closed. So ordered.

The Board directed Mr. Tableman to send a letter of appreciation to Mrs. Bintz in recognition of Mr. Bintz's many contributions to the Board.

Mr. Ceasar spoke regarding disposal of

urban renewal rubbish. Mr. Pesterfield will investigate.

The next meeting will be held March 29, 1967, at 7:30 p.m., in Room G-30, City Hall.

The informal meeting closed at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

MARVIN TABLEMAN,
Chairman,

NORMA DONOVAN,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, March 9, 1967

Meeting was called to order by Vice Chairman, Ralph Gunthrope at 7:30 p.m.

Members present: George Denfield, Larry Kain, William Miles, Ralph Gunthrope, John Brady and G. J. Turney—6.

Inspector: Leo Fox.

Members absent: George Wyllie, Councilman, Glen Dean—2.

Minutes of the last meeting was approved as read.

Discussion regarding the use of service weight "S.V." cast iron soil pipe.

Motion by Mr. Gunthrope. The Plumbing Board to amend the City Plumbing Code, Article III, Section 10, paragraph A. to permit the use of service weight cast iron soil pipe in conformity with the State Plumbing Code.

Seconded by Mr. Denfield.

Motion carried.

Motion by Mr. Kain that the effective date be May 1st.

Seconded by Mr. Brady.

Motion carried.

A discussion regarding the use of no hub cast iron soil pipe.

The board discussed the need of a permit to install or replace a water heater, so that all installations could be checked for safety standards. Mr. Fox was to obtain copies of regulations from other cities and give a report to the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 9 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
G. J. TURNEY, Secretary.

T/C

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, February 7, 1967

Meeting was called to order at 7:41 P.M.
by Chairman Ramona Bretz.

from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz and Siebert—5.

Absent: Black, Heino and Reynolds—3.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Z-188-66

Mr. Vernon C. Fountain, explained the proposed plans for the Community Unit Plan presented by Homer and Thayer Winegardner and Burdette Bottom, for property located in the 1800 and 1900 Block of Hoyt Street. Mr. Homer Winegardner, one of the owners of the property, stated that they had amended their petition requesting "D-M" multiple to the Community Unit Plan as it seemed possible that a lesser density may be more reasonable for this area. The density proposed is 12 units per acre.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

SS-20-66

No one appeared in favor or in opposition to the amendment to "I" heavy industrial district, excluding the use of stone mill quarry, the extraction of sand, gravel, turf or the removal of overburden which would alter the surface of the land.

Mr. Edwin P. Brown, Assistant Director, explained the proposed change.

Matter was referred to the Ordinance Committee.

Z-1-67

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 2727 Hollywood,

Z-5-67

Mr. Gerald J. Toman, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone a parcel at 5520 S. Cedar St. and the vacant lot adjacent north described as:

Commencing at the middle point in the South line of the Northeast $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 4, T3N, R2W, Township Delhi, now City of Lansing, thence Northerly 4 chains, thence South 62° West 8 chains 50 links to a post in the South line of said Northeast $\frac{1}{4}$, thence East 7 chains 50 links to the place of beginning, except the South 117 feet thereof. That part of the Northeast $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 4, T3N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, commencing at the South $\frac{1}{8}$ corner of said Northeast $\frac{1}{4}$, thence N. 0° 26' 30" East 264.0 feet at right angles to the East-West $\frac{1}{4}$ line of said Section 4, to the point of beginning, thence South 62° 22' 10" West 312.37 feet to a point 117.0 feet North of said East-West $\frac{1}{4}$ line, thence 275.62 feet parallel to said East-West $\frac{1}{4}$ line to the point of beginning, subject to rights of way of record,

from "A" one family residential to "F" commercial district. Mr. Toman stated he had nothing to add.

Mr. Gaus asked his intentions, and was advised that he hopes to use this for a music studio with instruction and sales.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-6-67

Mr. Joseph Lavey, Attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 411 W. Ionia Street from "D-M" multiple dwelling to "D-1" professional offices district. Mr. Lavey, stated that they propose to use this for law offices.

Mr. Guernsey, informed the Board that the Central City Plan proposes this area for office development.

Mr. Fink, asked if the site indicates adequate areas for parking, and Mr. Lavey advised that the site would accommodate six cars parallel or four at a 30 degree angle, which they feel would be adequate. There is not much traffic for law offices. There would only be one or two cars at a time.

Mr. Fink, asked the square footage of the building, and Mr. Lavey replied that he did not have the information. The east 24 ft. x 66 ft. would be devoted to parking.

Mrs. Bretz, asked the petitioner to furnish the staff with the amount of square footage the building covers.

Mr. Gaus, asked if the building is to be used as is, and was advised that the kitchen fixtures will be removed. The upstairs may be rented for offices or it might be rented to roomers. Two bedrooms will be used for a library. He has had inquiries about using this area for a phone answering service. He has no plans for upstairs. The front portion will be used for the library.

Mr. Siebert, asked if this is part of Lot 1? Mr. Lavey stated that it could have been. He then mentioned the size of other parcels of land adjacent to this.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-7-67

Mr. Jack Nichols, of the Mobil Oil Company, appeared in behalf of the petition, by Arnold Kegebein to rezone the property at 117, 121, 129 E. St. Joseph and 616 and 618 S. Grand Avenue, from "D" apartment to "E-2" drive-in shop. Mr. Nichols, stated that they would like to develop the property with a ranch type service station of masonry construction. They have no particular plans available for this site, however, they presented an artist's conception and site plan. They will prepare a plot plan and drawings.

Mr. Fink, asked the dimensions, and was advised that there is 165 ft. frontage on St. Joseph and 141.7 feet on Grand.

Mrs. Bretz, asked if there was one house between this site and the root beer stand, and was advised that there was.

Mr. Fink, asked the total family units, and was advised that they did not have that information.

Mr. Arnold Kegebein, advised that there is one vacant now. In addition, there is a two family, a three family, another two family and a one family.

Mrs. Bretz stated that there were 12 families in these houses.

Mr. Nichols mentioned that the plans presented are for a 140 x 140 size, whereas they propose a 165 x 141 for this site.

Mr. Fink, asked if they could present plans within the next two weeks for the Zoning Committee, and Mr. Nichols, replied that he would be unable to complete the survey by that time, but will have plans presented on curb cuts, etc. by their own people. Their people will be in touch with the Staff, and they will develop in accordance with the recommendations of the Staff.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-8-67

Mr. Jack Nichols, of Mobil Oil appeared, with Mr. Arnold Kegebein in behalf of the petition to rezone property, at the S.W. corner of Saginaw and Logan St. (approximately 1100 Blk. Saginaw and 600 Blk. Logan) described as:

Lots 15 through 19 of Standard Real Estate Company Westmoreland Addition

from "B" one family residence to "E-2" drive-in.

Mr. Guernsey read a letter from Mr. William J. Porter, of Porter Realty, representing Mr. A. L. Hummel, owner of property at 1117 W. Saginaw St., opposing the rezoning and informing the Board of the Deed Restrictions on the property in this area.

Mr. Guernsey further informed the Board that a letter had been received from Mr. Kegebein, asking that the petition be delayed because of the deed restrictions.

Mr. Nichols reported that they had selected this site and options were obtained. Then they discovered the deed restrictions. They intend to contact the people in the area to determine their attitude. They would like to develop the corner, but do not want to go in under adverse conditions. They plan on contacting everyone in the subdivision, and if it is not desired, the station will not be put in this area.

Mrs. Bretz, asked how long they would like the matter tabled, and was advised thirty days.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus, that the petition be tabled for 30 days, and that notices be sent to the neighborhood of the hearing to be held at that time.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Joseph Covello, owner of the property at 609 and 611 Logan, stated that he was opposed to any kind of drive-in. There are 30 children in the area. He has a lot next

to his home where the children play. His property was purchased in 1949, and he was aware of the deed restrictions. The corner was asked for rezoning about 10 years ago and was turned down. It is now built with houses. He doesn't feel neighbors would want a drive-in to depreciate their property and present a hazard for the children. There is enough traffic at this intersection now. He stated he feels the neighbors will sign a petition. He asked that he be notified of the next meeting.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-9-67

Mr. Maurice K. Gamel, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone a parcel immediately west of 3532 W. Jolly Road described as:

Commencing on Section line 1758.01 ft. West of South $\frac{1}{4}$ post, Section 31, thence and North 300 ft. West 55 ft. South 300 ft., East 55 ft. to beginning; Section 31, T4N, R2W,

Also, commencing on Section line 1703.1 ft. West of South $\frac{1}{4}$ post, Section 31, thence North 300 ft. West 55 ft., South 300 ft. 55 ft. to beginning, Section 31, T4N, R2W

from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district. Mr. Gamel advised that he is one of the owners. They intend to supply the area with low income apartments. They feel this would be conducive to the area. It is quite blighted along Jolly Road. There is a possibility of Jolly Road being widened to four lanes. Some of the property is not being taken care of and it would not be conducive to one family homes. Their plans call for one and two bedroom apartments ranging in price from \$100 to \$130 per month.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Mr. Reynolds came in at 8:20 P.M.

Z-10-67

Mr. Norman J. Eipper, Jr. appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone a parcel at 1410 E. Kalamazoo St., from "B" one family to "D-1" professional offices district. Mr. Eipper submitted a plot plan and a design of the building. He intends to use it for a real estate office. His thought was to redo the architecture to make it one of a residential nature. It has been a gas station which is no longer in use.

Mr. Siebert asked if the gas station is to be demolished and was advised that it would not be. The floor plan has been laid

out. The wall will be moved over and the height reduced.

Mr. Reynolds asked if there would be rental space and was advised that there would be none. The upstairs will be used for storage.

Mr. Reynolds remarked that there would be parking for twelve cars. Mr. Eipper added that plants would break the view of a lot full of parked cars. Front lot of parking for auxiliary. There are 6 spaces in the rear of lot for office staff. The grade level at the rear of the lot is approximately 5 feet. They may need to buy additional land for parking or might check with the building inspector for a variance. The area is presently paved and would lend itself to this use.

Mr. Siebert asked if the building on the site would be enlarged, and was advised that it would not be. They would drop the parapit and would make a half story above the eyebrow windows.

Mr. Manz wondered if Mr. Eipper were not confused on the number of parking spaces allowed. Mr. Guernsey mentioned that there could be no parking in the front yard, and there were two front yards on this lot. The petitioner needs to apply to the building inspector for a variance.

Mr. Eipper added that the Building Inspector stated that he must have the Planning Board action before he could accept the request for a variance.

Mr. Siebert, asked if on the east side there were an alley and then a retaining wall, and was informed that there is no retaining wall. There is a slight grade at the southeast corner rising to the alley and then a house. The billboard is to be removed. The alley is being used and there may be some garages off it, so it would not be available for parking.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-11-67

Robert C. June, M.D., appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 403 N. Sycamore and 712 W. Shiawassee, from "D-M" multiple to "D-1" professional offices district, but had nothing to add to the information filed on his petition.

Mr. Gaus, asked the location of the properties, and was advised they are side by side.

Mr. Fink asked if the buildings would be removed, and was advised that they would not be as both are to be used for professional use.

Mr. Guernsey recalled for the Board that the Central City Plan calls for multiple family apartments. He mentioned the next

closest professional offices district and gave an explanation of the change in the zoning code.

Mr. Siebert, asked if this were zoned "D-M" now, and was advised that it is.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Recess from 8:39 to 9:28 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

Z-208-66

Motion by Fink, seconded by Siebert, that a public hearing be set on the Community Unit Plan submitted by John Bondarenko, for property at 2920 S. Pleasant Grove Road for 7:30 P.M., February 21st, in Court Room No. 1, 6th Floor of City Hall.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-221-65

Motion by Fink, seconded by Siebert, that a public hearing be set on the Community Unit Plan submitted by St. Vincent dePaul, for property located at 4631 and 4706 S. Logan Street for 7:30 P.M. on February 21st, in Court Room No. 1, 6th Floor of City Hall.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-154-66

Motion by Fink, seconded by Siebert, that the board set a public hearing on the Community Unit Plan submitted by Schafer Realty for property in the 100 and 200 block E. Jolly Road for 7:30 P.M., February 21st in Court Room No. 1, 6th Floor of City Hall.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-180-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Marvin DeWald, to rezone a parcel at 4806 S. Logan St. described as:

Com. N.E. corner Lot 32, thence N. 89° 54' W. 391.5 ft. 50° 37' West 180 ft. South 89° 53' East along North line Briarfield Drive 389.3 ft. to West line South Logan Street, Northly along West line, South Logan Street to begin-

ning except Easterly 10 ft. thereof; Supervisor's Plat No. 4 Section 32, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" residential to "F" commercial district be denied as filed, and that

The West 80 ft. of the property

be rezoned from "A" one family to "C" two family district, and

The balance of the property

be rezoned from "A" one family to "D-1" professional office district.

The Board would further be amenable to enough commercial zoning to accommodate the redevelopment of the sound studio.

This would allow the property owner to rebuild the existing use on the property, and provide a transitional use between the existing residential development to the west.

Platting should precede any further development of the property if the zoning request is to be approved.

Mr. Reynolds asked if we would need another hearing for platting, and Mr. Guernsey replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Manz mentioned that he thought the "F" area was needed for the development of a sound studio and that area should be described.

Further discussion followed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-184-66

Motion by Fink, seconded by Reynolds, that the petition by Leo A. Farhat, Attorney for Warner Long Dev. Co., to rezone a parcel at 3328 W. Jolly Road from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple district be tabled pending a decision from the City Attorney relative to deed restrictions.

Motion carried by unanimous vote:

Z-193-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Manz, that the petition by Cambridge Development Company, Robert E. Savage to rezone property in the 2800 and 2900 block of Averill Drive described as:

Lots numbered 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 180, 181, 182, 187 and 198 Scotsdale Sub-division No. 2

from "A" one family to "C" two family residence district be tabled for thirty days, or if the plans are received by the Staff in time, the matter will be brought up for the meeting on February 21st.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-197-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Theodore W. Swift, Attorney, for Super Par Oil Co., Inc. to rezone a parcel at 917 E. Cavanaugh Road, from "E-1" drive-in-shop to "F" commercial district be denied as filed, and the property be zoned "E-2" drive-in-shop.

"F" commercial zoning of the entire site would permit use of the property that would not be in the best interest of the community such as:

A more intense commercial use than now exists on the site could have an adverse affect on the residential development to the North and West.

Service stations such as this have been converted to other uses that are detrimental to adjacent properties.

Permit over development of the site, which could reduce site distance for automotive traffic at the intersection of two major streets, also not leaving adequate area for off-street parking.

The numerous vacant service stations at this intersection and the Pennsylvania Ave.-Jolly Road intersection give a strong indication that a supporting market does not exist at this time. Therefore, we could assume that if this type of conversion is allowed there will be other request, and eventually there is a diversity of uses occupying the several service stations which could detract from Planned Commercial Centers.

The apartment development adjacent to this site is new, and should be protected as much as possible from the adverse influences of commercial uses.

Mr. Reynolds asked if this would allow him to do what he wants, and Mr. Fink answered basically "No", however, the usage proposed would not be in the best interest of the community.

Some discussion followed on what would be allowed in the "E-1" and "E-2" districts.

Mr. Gaus stated he felt if this gas station use were allowed, the Board would not be consistent. The gas station was there before the apartment. The station at the southeast corner is to be considered for a hearing at the Board meeting next month.

Mr. Guernsey mentioned that oil companies have over-built in the area and this occurred before annexation to Lansing. This type of function may be able to work out some worthwhile use for the buildings.

Mr. Fink added that the corner may have been rezoned without the Board's recommendation as some were rezoned while in the township. The area of responsibility belongs to the oil company the owner.

Mr. Guernsey remarked that the Board has recommended consistently in certain areas gas stations be denied.

Mr. Reynolds concluded that most filling stations now are very close to a commercial business, and they propose here to upgrade the station, therefore, he believed it should be commercial because of the sales.

Mr. Fink called the Board's attention to Z-198-66 and the recommendation of the committee.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-198-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Theodore W. Swift, Attorney, for Super Par Oil Company, Inc. to rezone a parcel in the 3506 N. East Street described as:

Lots 4, 5 and 6, except the East 15 feet thereof, Plat of Woodlawn Sub-division, a part of the N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section

N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 3, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, County of Ingham, State of Michigan

from "A" one family to "F" commercial district be denied as filed and that

The East 3 ft.

be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking and

The balance of the property

be rezoned from "A" one family to "F" commercial.

Screening to be provided along the East property line except for a 20 ft. set-back on Sanford Street.

Screening to consist of one of the following:

A 5 ft high, chain link fence with interwoven slats.

A 3 ft. high chain link fence with continuous dense evergreen plantings.

Any other type of screening that may be suggested by the developer with the approval of the Planning Department.

The site requested for rezoning falls within the mixed strip commercial development in this area of North East St.

Complete denial of the request would be unreasonable because of the existing land use pattern and would discourage occupancy of a vacant building.

Commercial zoning would allow uses compatible with the commercial development to the north.

The residential development to the east is made up of modest single family homes. It is reasonable to assume that the residential development adjacent to the strip commercial will, in the near future, be redeveloped. When the redevelopment does occur steps can be taken to provide for adequate open space and screening from the strip commercial development. This will reduce the adverse influences and pressures.

Mr. Fink asked about the three foot strip, and Mr. Fountain answered that it was needed to keep litter off Sanford Street.

Mr. Reynolds asked if it were zoned commercial, would the setback be off East Street, and Mr. Guernsey replied that the Zoning Code requires a 20 foot setback.

Mr. Manz pointed out the zoning on the north half is non-conforming, and perhaps the block should be rezoned. Mr. Fountain discussed the parking lot.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds, Gaus and Siebert—6.

Nay: None.

Motion by Manz, seconded by Gaus, that a hearing be set for the rezoning of the north half of the 3500 Block N. East Street to rezone the property to "F" commercial and "J" parking.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nay: None.

Z-199-66

Motion by Fink, seconded by Reynolds that the petition by Robert O. Ridenour, to rezone a parcel at 3615 W. Jolly Road, from "A" one family to "B" one family be

tabled until the next meeting pending the submission of a corrected legal by the petitioner's attorney.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-200-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Claude Jenks, to rezone a parcel in the 4616 S. Logan and vacant lot to the south, described as:

Lots numbered 102 and 103 of Supervisors Plat of Prosperity Farms No. 1 being a part of the south $\frac{1}{2}$ of Section 32, T4N, R2W, Lansing Township, Ingham County, Michigan, formerly known as Lots numbered 102 and 103 of the proposed plat of Prosperity Farms No. 2

from "A" one family residence to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied as filed and that

The west 25 ft. of the property be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking and

The balance of the property

be zoned "D-M" multiple dwelling district with screening along the west line of the "J" parking district.

Screening to consist of one of the following:

A 5 ft. high dense hedge.

A 5 ft. high chain link fence with dense evergreen plantings having a mature height of 5 ft. to 5 ft. 6 in.

A 5 ft. high chain link fence with interwoven slats.

Or any other type of screening that may be suggested by the developer and approved by the Planning Department.

If this land were part of an overall development plan where steps could be taken to reduce the adverse affect of Logan Street and the adjacent land uses, it would be reasonable to apply strict zoning controls.

There are strong pressures for extending strip commercial zoning along Logan Street. The approval of this request would discourage the strip commercial development, and provide a better transition between the highly traveled thoroughfare and the single family residence to the west.

The recent amendments to the "D-M" multiple district provide for a lower density and an increase in off-street parking. This has reduced some of the objections to this type of request, where land use transitions exist or have changed, warrant-

ing change of zoning not in accord with the Comprehensive Plan.

The Board does not believe the uses allowed under the "D-M" district will have any adverse affect on the adjacent properties providing provisions for screening are required.

Sewers in the vicinity are adequate to handle the use that will be allowed with the proposed change, but further requests of this nature will require additional review of the sewer situation.

In general, the site meets the criteria for outlying apartment development along a major street-state trunkline.

Mr. Reynolds mentioned that the set back of 20 feet for "J" parking to protect the "A" residential to the west and wondered if this would have to be paved, and was advised if it were used for parking purposes, it would have to be paved.

Mr. Gaus asked if it would be possible to require a screening area, and was advised that it cannot be done under the present code.

Mr. Fountain remarked that the deletion of front yard parking would probably make this area used for parking.

Mr. Reynolds asked where the Board's policy of development along Logan ended, and was advised it would end at Pierce Road.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-201-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Clyde J. Olin acting for, Nicholas C. Jefferies, to rezone a parcel at 5757 S. Cedar Street described as:

Com. 660 ft. East and 1069 feet South of the North $\frac{1}{6}$ post of S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 4, T3N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, thence W. 127.5 ft. to former MUT ROW, then S. W'ly along said ROW to a point S. of the point of beg. thence N. 313 to point of beginning

from "D" apartments to "F" commercial district, be denied as filed and that

The East 20 ft. of the property parallel to the East property line and the westerly 20 ft. of the property parallel to the westerly property line

be rezoned from "D" apartment to "J" parking, and

The balance of the property

be rezoned from "D" apartment to "F" commercial, with a 3 ft. high chain link fence to be provided along the westerly property line.

The Board believes that the fence will provide safety factor for automobile traffic along this area of Cedar St., eliminating the numerous points of ingress and egress to this site.

The shape of the lot does not allow adequate development in the "D" apartment zone.

The site is located on a major arterial which carries a high traffic volume lending itself to easy access.

The land uses in the vicinity consists of mixed residential, commercial and light industrial so the proposed use would not be out of character with the existing uses in the area.

Mr. Guernsey mentioned that the right-of-way on Cedar St. included the old interurban lines. There is an acute angle at Kaynorth which is dangerous. The Staff suggested working with the petitioner on the feasibility of a trade to turn Kaynorth at right angles to Cedar St. This trade would improve the building site with the petitioner.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Reynolds, that the Rules of Procedure be suspended so that Mr. Clyde Olin, representative for the petitioner could speak.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Olin stated that he had a discussion with the purchaser of the property, and he has already contacted the highway department for the trade. They think it can be worked out and is very feasible. If it is zoned as outlined, he feels his client will pursue other angles for better property.

Mr. Fink asked if the right-of-way needed rezoning. Mr. Guernsey suggested that the Board recommend on the rezoning and pass it on to Council. He felt sure that the right-of-way matter could be handled administratively and it would not delay the processing.

Mr. Guernsey further added that the Staff would examine with the petitioner the possibility of the realignment of Kaynorth with Cedar Street.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-202-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by James F. Walter, to rezone a parcel a 220 N. Chestnut Street, from "D" apartment to "D-1" professional offices district, be granted.

The Central City Development Plan indicates the proposed use of the area for offices and services.

Development of offices within this proposed office-service area will discourage further scattering of this type of use throughout the areas proposed for low density residential, state offices, and high rise apartment development.

Zoning as requested requires off-street parking.

Mr. Reynolds asked if this were in accord with the Central City Plan, and Mr. Guernsey answered this is an office zone.

Mr. Fink asked how rigid was the enforcement on the number of parking spaces in relation to the size of the building, and was informed that it is being enforced quite well.

Some discussion was held on the court case relative to illegal parking.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-203-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Reynolds, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Joseph R. Maurer, to rezone a parcel at 4703 North Grand River Avenue described as:

Lots No. 5 and 6 of Westmont Sub-division

from "A" one family to "F" commercial be denied as filed, and that

The North 50 ft. of the South 60 ft. of Lots 5 and 6

be rezoned from "A" one family to "E" apartment shop, and

The balance of the property

be zoned "J" parking, with screening to be provided along the south line of Lots 5 and 6 except for a 25 ft. set-back on Alfred Avenue.

Screening to consist of one of the following:

A 5 ft. high dense privet hedge.

A 5 ft. high chain link fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 5 ft. to 5 ft. 6 in.

A 5 ft. high chain link fence with interwoven slats.

Or any other type of screening suggested by developer with the approval from the Planning Department.

The Board further recommends that the northerly 10 ft. lying parallel to N. Grand River Ave. be maintained in lawn area, with no access to Grand River Avenue.

The site falls within the strip of commercial development along this area of North Grand River Avenue.

Because of adjacent commercial development and changes to commercial zoning in the vicinity, it would be unreasonable to assume that the subject property would develop in a residential nature.

A change of zoning will encourage development with improvements to the property.

Mr. Fink asked if the recommendation is adequate in not asking for a right-of-way screening along Grand River.

Mr. Guernsey stated that in the "J" parking district, the Planning Board is authorized by the Zoning Ordinance to require screening. The Board can designate the type of screening. If Council rezones as recommended, it is the Board's responsibility to designate the screening.

Mr. Siebert stated that they wanted to prevent ingress and egress off Grand River.

Mr. Fink asked if this screening shouldn't be designated?

Mr. Gaus asked if any other restriction in the area were set for this type of a setback for a screen area?

Discussion followed on the reasoning for this request.

Mr. Manz asked if we were being inconsistent in granting the "D" apartment rather than the "F" commercial?

Mr. Fink stated that this meets the needs of the petitioner. They would like to maintain the usage of less than "F". There is a screen area along the Golf Course.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-204-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the Board recommend to City Council that

the petition by Barbara L. Frahm, to rezone a parcel at 1526 N. Logan Street, from "B" one family residence to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied.

The changes would be contrary to the Master Land Use Plan, which indicates this area as medium density (4-10 dwelling units per net acre).

The change would be contrary to the existing land use development in the vicinity which is predominantly single family residential.

The change of zoning would allow development that would adversely affect the adjacent single family residential development by an increase of traffic and activity, and direct encroachment on the privacy of the adjacent single family areas.

Where an apartment zone abuts a single family zone the edges of the latter are subject to adverse influences and pressures of greater populations and building densities, higher and larger buildings, greater traffic and similar factors.

Such single family residential property may be less desirable, its values may be reduced and the area can be generally less stable.

Apartment development is generally accepted as a transition between single family development and commercial or industrial, and where possible additional open space is encouraged between the multiple development and single family.

Where apartment development has occurred on lots intended for single family homes the result has usually been poor orientation of the building to the lot and over intense use of asphalt necessary to accommodate parking needs.

There are no changing conditions in the neighborhood sufficient to warrant a change of zoning.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-205-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by John S. and Harriet E. Anthony, to rezone a parcel at 2224 N. Grand River described as:

Beginning the S.E. corner of Lot 6, James M. Turner Subdivision, of part of S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 5 and of Lots 10, 11, 14, 15, 18, 19, 22, 23 and parts of Lots 25, 26, 27, Townsend Subdivision of parts of Section 4, 5, 8 and 9; thence northwesterly on N. line of W.

Grand River Ave. 156 ft., N. 27° , E. 132 ft., N. $8^{\circ} 45$ min., E. 87 ft. E. 49.5 ft., to E. line of Lot 6, S. 300.6 ft. to beginning, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one residential to "F" commercial district be denied as filed, and that;

The portion of the property described as commencing at the Southeast corner of the property, thence northwesterly along the north line of West Grand River Ave. 85 ft., thence North 60 ft., thence northeasterly 110 ft. to a point 40 ft. west of the east property line, thence east 40 ft. to the east property line, thence south along the east property line to beginning, (except the southerly 30 ft. lying parallel to Grand River Ave. remain in "A" one family residential)

be rezoned from "A" one family to "F" commercial and

The balance of the property

be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking.

The existing flower shop on the site is non-conforming, and is limited to any expansion or major improvements.

The property has direct access to a major street.

Because of the nature of existing uses in the area, and the Master Plan Proposal for Industrial Expansion, it would be unreasonable to assume that the property owner would promote further development in accord with the existing zoning.

The property owner plans to remove the residential dwelling and greenhouse and provide for additional off-street parking. When this is completed the parking would be removed from the front of the existing flower shop and that area converted into lawn area. These are some of the objectives we strive to attain through zoning controls, and if carried out, would remove some objections when considering nonconforming development.

Mr. Manz asked if there were any driveway across this residential zone, and Mr. Fountain reported that the curb cuts are to be taken out and moved to another location.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-206-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the Board make no recommendation on the

petition by William A. Maschke, acting for Donald J. Moore, to rezone a parcel at 403 S. Sycamore and 623 W. Kalamazoo St., from "D" apartments to "E" apartments district. There was no consensus within the Zoning Committee.

Mr. Manz stated that he felt that the Board lacked fortitude, and that they should make a recommendation.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink and Siebert—3.

Nay: Gaus, Manz and Reynolds—3.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that the petition be granted.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Gaus, Manz and Reynolds—4.

Nay: None.

Abstain: Fink and Siebert—2.

Z-207-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Hubert Will, to rezone a parcel at 3002 Turner described as:

S. 80 ft. Lot 1, Nearnings Subdivision from "A" one family to "F" commercial district be denied as filed, and that

The East 75 ft. of the property be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking, and

The balance of the property be rezoned from "A" one family to "F" commercial. Screening to be provided along the East property line except for a 20 ft. set-back on Howe Avenue.

Screening to consist of one of the following:

A 5 ft. high dense privet hedge.

A 5 ft. high chain link fence with dense evergreen plantings.

A 5 ft. high chain link fence with interwoven slats.

Or any other type of screening suggested by the developer, with approval of the Planning Department.

The property fronts on Turner Street which carries a high volume of traffic, 5000 V.P.D./1965.

There are mixed land uses in the area which were developed prior to annexation to the City of Lansing, without proper zoning controls.

The site has been used under its current use since the area was annexed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nay: None.

Z-2-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Board recommend to City Council that their petition to rezone the property at 5341 South Pennsylvania Avenue described as:

Lots 49 and 50 of Battenfield Sub-division No. 2

from "A" one family residence to "G-2" wholesale district, be denied as filed and that

The West 30 ft. of the property be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking, and

The balance of the property be rezoned from "A" one family to "F" commercial district.

Much of the development in this area took place prior to annexation. The existing commercial uses became non-conforming upon annexation to the City of Lansing. This has posed some problems for both the property owners and enforcement of city regulations inasmuch as:

The property owner is limited to any major improvements, and the city cannot force any major improvements without proper zoning.

The consequence of this lack of off-street parking, poor housekeeping, inadequate screening for adjacent residential properties, and controls over other specific types of uses that may be proposed for the site.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nay: None.

Z-3-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Board recommend to City Council that their petition to rezone property at the 4601 N. Grand River Avenue described as:

Lots 1 and 2 Westmont Subdivision

from "A" one family to "F" commercial district, be denied as filed and that

Lot 1 of Westmont Subdivision except the south 50 ft.

Lot 2 of Westmont Subdivision except the south 50 ft. and the north 20 ft. lying parallel to Grand River Avenue

be rezoned from "A" one family to "E-2" drive-in-shop, and

The balance of Lot 1 and Lot 2

be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking.

Screening to be provided along the south line of Lots 1 and 2 except for a 20 ft. setback on Andrew Avenue.

Screening to consist of the following.

A 6 ft. high chain link fence with interwoven slats, or any other type of screening that may be suggested by the property owner, with the approval of the Planning Department.

Lighting to be provided on the parking area at a minimum of 2/10 lumens per sq. ft. so directed on the parking area so as not to affect adjacent properties or automobile traffic on the adjacent streets.

The Board further recommends that access from Grand River Avenue into this commercial complex, be limited to one curb cut to be formed jointly on the east line of Lot 3 and the west line of Lot 2, a common line, and further the property owners be encouraged to coordinate in the development and use of the parking area.

The entire block fronting on Grand River Ave. between Alfred and Andrew Ave. with the available parking facilities, qualifies as a neighborhood shopping area.

Frontage of the complex does not conflict with the adjacent single family residential.

Examination of the present uses in the block, their variety and their arrangements, with the existing parking, indicates that appropriate zoning would be in the community's interest.

Some discussion was held on the setback requirements.

Motion carried by the following votes:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nay: None.

Z-4-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Board recommend to City Council that their petition to rezone property at 4613 N. Grand River Avenue described as:

Lots 3 and 241 Westmont Subdivision from "A" one family residence to "F" commercial district, be denied as filed and that

Lot 3 Westmont Subdivision except the North 20 ft. lying parallel to Grand River Avenue

be rezoned from "A" one family to "F" commercial, and the

Balance of Lot 3 and all of Lot 241

be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking.

Screening to be provided along the south line of Lot 241 except for a 20 ft. setback on Alfred Avenue.

Screening to consist of the following:

A 6 ft. high chain link fence with interwoven slats, or any other type of screening that may be suggested by the property owner, with the approval of the Planning Department.

Lighting to be provided on the parking area at a minimum of 2/10 lumens per square foot so directed on the parking area so as not to affect adjacent properties or automobile traffic on adjacent street.

The Board further recommends that access from Grand River Avenue into this commercial complex, be limited to one curb cut to be formed jointly on the east line of Lot 3 and the west line of Lot 2, a common line, and further the property owners be encouraged to coordinate in the development and use of the parking area.

The entire block fronting on Grand River Avenue between Alfred and Andrew Avenue with the available parking facilities, qualifies as a neighborhood shopping area.

Frontage of the complex does not conflict with the adjacent single family residential.

Examination of the present uses in the block, their variety and their arrangements, with the existing parking, indicates that appropriate zoning would be in the community's interest.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nay: None.

SS-2-62

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Manz, that the requested amendment to the Community

Unit Plan, for the High Rise Tower at Pine and Ottawa Street, be approved subject to the Building Inspector certifying number of parking spaces available for the approved Community Unit Plan, and the developer be requested to show where additional parking may be provided if the commercial area is increased an additional 1400 sq. ft., with one parking space for each 200 sq. ft. of additional commercial area.

Discussion on the original conditions of approval followed. Discussion followed concerning the administrative process to be followed.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Siebert, that the Board approve the design of the use for this particular part of the building by approving the additional commercial would be subject to the certification of adequate parking for the total area of the building itself. Upon certification by the Building Inspector, it would go immediately to Council and if not it would be returned to the Board for their action.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

STREET COMMITTEE

S-7-62F

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that the Board notify City Council they disapproved the final plat of Somerset Subdivision No. 3 in accordance with the Lansing Subdivision Regulations which include the following:

Section VA (1) The proposed subdivision and its ultimate use shall be in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan as adopted and shall not encroach upon any area designated in the Comprehensive Plan for future public use.

Section VB (1) The arrangement, character, extent, width, and location of all streets shall conform to the Major Street Plan as adopted by the Planning Board and shall be considered in their relation to existing and planned streets, to topographic conditions, to public convenience and safety, and in their appropriate relation to the proposed use of the land to be served by such streets.

It should be pointed out that the planned route of US 127 relocated is part of the Major Street Plan which is in turn a part of the Comprehensive Master Plan as adopted by the Planning Board and recorded in the file of the Ingham County Register of Deeds on November 2, 1961.

The Planning Board recommends that this plat be disapproved by the City Council in

accordance with the Michigan State Plat Act, being Act 172, Public Acts of 1929, as amended.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds, and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

S-1-63P

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that the developer, Mr. Howard Kussmaul, be advised that the Preliminary Plat of Forest Park is approved subject to the following conditions:

Final plat to be developed with public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and Lansing Subdivisions Regulations.

Construction and improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior to approval of the final plat.

Street right-of-way should be 66 feet with 36 foot pavement. A right-of-way dedication of 43 feet north of the east and west $\frac{1}{4}$ line of Section 26 for Forest Road should be provided.

All lots should be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.

This approval shall expire February 7, 1968.

Mr. Siebert asked if there were any future plans for an Arboretum Road, and if there would be any tie in with the property on either side?

Mr. Guernsey recalled for the Board that the preliminary plat was submitted about two years ago. The west could be a cul-de-sac. This plat would allow development on both sides.

Mr. Siebert asked if the owners own only the small area and was advised that they did.

Mr. Fink asked if this is part of arboretum too, this area between two developments, and was advised that it was. He further asked, that in view of the limitation of the area, if the Staff had any plans for future platting?

Mr. Fountain explained that the plat would take into consideration both sites. A sketch was presented to the Board for their review.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

S-14-66F

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that the Board notify City Council that they approve the Final Plat of Delray Manor and they recommend that it be approved by City Council subject to the following conditions:

All public improvements shall be installed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewers, storm sewers, and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks, and such other improvements as required under Section VI D of the Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

The posting of financial security in the amount of:

Monuments	\$ 220
Sanitary Sewers	2,500
Total	\$2,720

prior to the signing and affixing of the municipal seal.

All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Act of 1929 as amended shall apply.

No vehicular ingress or egress from Lot 12 to Logan Street.

Mr. Fink asked if this meets the criteria as set forth by the Board? Mr. Fountain replied that all the restrictions are on the brown line of the hardbacks.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

S-19-66P

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that Mr. Gerald E. Ernst, City Assessor, be notified that the Preliminary Plat of Assessor's Plat No. 57 was approved and the required public improvements are waived.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

S-20-66P

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that the preliminary plat of Midstate Replat of Lot 1, Assessor's Plat No. 18 be approved subject to the following conditions:

Final plat to be developed with public

improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

A right-of-way dedication of 6 feet along Kalamazoo Street should be provided.

All lots should be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.

This approval shall expire February 7, 1968.

Mr. Fink asked how many apartments can be put on this, and Mr. Church replied 25. At 29 per acre he would get 87 on 3 acres. Mr. Fink then asked what effect this would have on the rest of the neighborhood? Curb cuts are on Kalamazoo and would present a traffic hazard.

Mr. Guernsey advised the Board that the developer could add on to the buildings there now making it a barracks type. By approving this plat, this would mean he would have to build a separate building.

Mr. Fink advised that there are several curb cuts with approximately 90 cars. It is almost impossible to enter and exit from this area.

Mr. Reynolds added that Kalamazoo St. has heavy traffic. I-496 will take away from this some. The park across the street cuts down the density per acre.

Discussion on the density zoning and what could be developed on the property followed.

Mr. Fink asked if there were 20 units per acre on three acres now?

Mr. Guernsey mentioned that the only way the city can obtain a six foot right-of-way for acceleration or deceleration lanes is by this platting. Some discussion was held on whether or not this would be enough for another lane.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Fink, that the matter be tabled.

Mr. Guernsey reminded the Board that the City Council must act on this within 30 days, or it would automatically be approved.

Mr. Gaus withdrew his motion, and Mr. Fink withdrew his second.

Original motion failed by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Gaus, Manz and Reynolds.

Nays: Fink and Siebert—2.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Manz, that the preliminary plat be given some special thought and reconsidered.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Manz and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that the Preliminary Plat be approved.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

ROW-1-67

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that after considering the letter from Les Seidel, requesting the vacation of the alley in the 3300 block S. Cedar Street described as:

West 20 feet of the North 50 feet of Lot Number 15, Block 2, Oak Crest Subdivision of a part of the S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 28, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

that the vacation be approved.

The Plat of Oak Crest Subdivision was approved in 1916 without an alley on the western boundary of Lot 15. On November 14, 1951, the 20 x 50 ft. alley under consideration was deeded to the city. The Assessor's records do not show that the westerly 20 ft. of the southerly 236.5 ft. of Lot 15 was ever deeded to the city for alley purposes. As a result of this action the alley has never been improved or does it have access to a public right-of-way.

All city departments and utilities contacted approved the vacation of this landlocked alley. The Board does not believe that this alley will be needed in the future.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

ORDINANCE

SS-23-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Board inform City Council that they approved the following amendment to the City of Lansing Subdivision Regulation:

V E 7. That a minimum lot width of

all lots platted or created from existing parcels, lots or unplatted land, in the City of Lansing, after the effective date of this amendment, shall be 60 feet at the building line, except on corner lots where the minimum shall be 70 feet.

The average floor area of residential homes constructed since World War II has been on the increase, requiring larger lots to allow adequate sites for the structures, yards, and open areas. In view of this and to provide a minimum standard for the plating of lots it is desirous to adopt a minimum lot width of 60 ft.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

SS-29-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Board notify City Council that they approved the following amendments to the City of Lansing Subdivision Regulations:

Section V. B

2. Public right-of-way widths shall be as shown on the Major Street Plan, and unless otherwise indicated on the Major Street Plan, shall be not less than the following:

Classification	Right-of-way width
a. Freeway	300+ ft.
b. Expressway	200-300 ft.
c. Parkway	Varies (minimum 120 ft.)
d. Major Arterial	100-175 ft.
e. Minor Arterial	100-120 ft.
f. Collector	86-100 ft.
g. Local	60-66 ft.
h. Cul-de-sac	50-66 ft.
i. Alleys	20 ft.
j. Crosswalks (pedestrian ways)	10 ft.
k. Utility easements	12 ft.
l. Additional street right-of-way width	may be required to assure adequate access, circulation and parking in subdivisions within high density residential areas, commercial areas and industrial areas.
m. Where a proposed subdivision abuts or contains an existing street of inadequate right-of-way width,	additional right-of-way width for the ex-

isting street may be required in conformance with the above standards.

- n. Rights-of-way in excess of 120 feet shall be reserved for a period of three years. Expressways and freeways excepted.
- o. Dedication of expressway and freeway right-of-way shall not be required. These rights-of-way may be reserved for public acquisition in accordance with Act 222, Public Acts, State of Michigan, 1943, as amended.

Section VI D 4

b. **Street surfacing width**—minimum street surfacing widths shall be as specified by the typical cross-sections of the Major Street Plan as adopted by the Planning Board.

a. Freeway	48-72 ft.
b. Expressway	48-96 ft.
c. Parkway	48 ft.
d. Major Arterial	48-60 ft.
e. Minor Arterial	48-60 ft.
f. Collector	44-48 ft.
g. Local	*22-36 ft.
h. Cul-de-sac	*22-36 ft.

*In case of low density residential development (2 or less housing units per acre) the local or cul-de-sac paving width may be lowered to 22 feet, where, in the judgement of the Planning Board, this width will be sufficient to accommodate the anticipated traffic volumes of the overall neighborhood. Added street pavement widths and thickness may be required for local streets which are designed to serve high density residential developments and commercial and industrial subdivisions.

c. **Curb and Gutter**—Curb and gutter of a type approved by the City Engineer shall be provided for all cul-de-sac, local, collector, minor, major streets or parkways within each subdivision.

Due to the rapid increase in the number of vehicles on the road and the development of the freeway system, it is desirable to set up uniform standards within the Tri-County area and develop a coordinated Major Street Plan for the area.

The Tri-County Regional Planning Commission is presently conducting a Land Use — Natural Resources — Transportation Study. One of the objectives of their study is to relate the transportation system of the area to insure that it efficiently and economically serves the area, and provides a framework for the coordination of future development.

The cross-sectional standards adopted by the Planning Board for the Major Street Plan of the Comprehensive Master Plan would insure that future platting of lands

will provide for adequate rights-of-ways for the future development of the entire area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Guernsey informed the Board, that the report is being printed.

A copy went to City Council for Monday night. 500 copies will be printed. Graphically and content wise, this is the best we have done.

FINANCE

Mr. Guernsey stated that the Boards budget hearing could be Wednesday or Thursday of this week. The Board will be notified by telephone as soon as we receive information on the hearing.

PLANNING DIRECTORS REPORT

Mr. Guernsey advised that the 60 ft. lot resolution has passed Council.

The Mayor has requested preparation of a demonstration city application.

The Zoning map will be brought before the Board on February 21st.

The Director has been invited to participate in a committee sponsored by the fine arts committee on the design of the mall.

Mr. Fink asked about the internal mass transit on the mall. Johnson, Johnson and Roy have been hired by the city, but are at a stand-off until a determination is made. Mass transit is to be incorporated as far as we know now.

Mr. Reynolds mentioned that he had made a preliminary study of the matter. His findings did not show enthusiasm, for this type of system. On the cars, the electric are too costly and the batteries are so large and heavy they would require a hoist for recharging. The gas engines would cost about \$3,000 and will hold 27 people. Two of these may be needed.

OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

Letter from E. Roy Scott, Michigan State Council for the Arts, was read and placed on file.

Letter from Mike Conlisk, of the East Lansing Planning Department, relative to the Red Cedar Basin was read and placed on file.

On the Community Services Council request for a co-sponsor for the 1967 Brotherhood Program, Mrs. Bretz, appointed Russell H. Fink, to act as liaison person for the Board.

The letter from the Michigan State Highway Department regarding Staff aid in a study of highways was read to the Board.

Mr. Fink asked how much time would be involved, and Mr. Guernsey stated he estimated there would be about two days labor for about one and one-half persons. He further recommended that the Board cooperate.

Motion by Manz, seconded by Fink, that

the Staff work with the State Highway Department on the study.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

NEW BUSINESS

Z-188-65

The requested amendment to the Community Unit Plan for the Kahres Farm located at 6326 S. Cedar Street was referred to the Zoning Committee for recommendation.

Meeting adjourned at 12:35 A.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

T/C

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, February 21, 1967

Meeting called to order at 7:39 P.M. by
Chairman Ramona J. Bretz.

Matter was referred to the Streets Com-
mittee.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino,
Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Absent: Black—1.

HEARINGS

S-9-63 Virginia Village

Mr. D. Gregory Main discussed the loca-
tion of the plat, the land use and explained
the plan as submitted by the developer.

Mr. Adolph Frantz, the Developer, was
not present.

Mrs. Aurel M. Petrie, 8106 Arcadia
mentioned she wondered what type of
apartment houses there would be, and Mr.
Main explained that this had not been de-
termined exactly. Mr. Brown added that
the property would have to be rezoned
before this type of development can be put
on this land.

Mr. Fink added further that this would
be considered on a density of about 12
units per acre or less to protect the resi-
dential nature of the area.

Mr. Reynolds asked if Waverly would
continue to Grand River, and was advised
it will be closed at Grand River, but would
have to remain open to the people in the
area that have homes there.

Six people were in the audience who were
interested in this plat.

Mr. Carl T. Stenson, of 3829 Delta River
Drive, asked about the roadways, and
mentioned his concern about more traffic
on Delta River Drive. Mr. Main explained
the roadway plans.

Discussion followed concerning the traf-
fic that might be using Delta River Drive.

Mr. Fink advised that the plans had been
altered to encourage traffic to utilize Grand
River Avenue.

S-1-67 Orchardvalley Subdivision

Mr. D. Gregory Main discussed the plat,
the present zoning, the number of lots and
their size.

Mr. Vernell Meese, the Developer, was
not present.

Mr. Thomas F. Peacock, 5619 Joshua
Street, asked if the area was zoned single
family, and was advised that it is not. He
stated he felt that the area should not be
zoned for two family, and that he was op-
posed to the two family units, but not to the
plat.

Mr. Manz noted it is now zoned "C"
two family and this hearing is just to con-
sider the plat.

Mr. Brown, added that this area was
petitioned for rezoning to "D-M" multiple
several months ago and was granted the
"C" two family classification.

Matter was referred to the Streets Com-
mittee.

Z-208-66

Community Unit Plan submitted by John
Bondarenko, for property located at 2920
S. Pleasant Grove Road.

Mr. Ronald R. Gierthy, of the Planning
Staff, explained the location, the land use
in the area, the zoning and the use pro-
posed by the developer.

Mr. John Bondarenko, advised that he
has an option on this property subject to
rezoning. Would like to develop with
moderate low density.

Mr. Cornelius Pettit, 2515 Victor, ap-
peared and advised that he represented
some people in the area who believed the
area should stay "A" one family. The
north end would be three feet from the
houses on Victor. Parking lots would be
adjacent to their homes. He mentioned
other requests for rezoning in the area

that had been turned down. He further mentioned the high traffic on Viking and Pleasant Grove. The schools are overcrowded. This would add more families, and could mean a loss in property values. The parking lots are approximately 10 ft. from his back yard which would deprive him of his privacy. He presented a petition with 147 signatures.

Mrs. Clement Laurion, 2714 Victor Street, stated that she wanted to reinforce Mr. Pettit's recommendation. There are three roads coming from the south, Deerfield, Viking, (an unimproved road) and Pleasant Grove Rd. There is a great deal of foot traffic. Victor is a poor road. There is a great deal more traffic than is needed in this residential area. With a new development it will be much more.

Mr. Edward J. Roe, 2509 Victor St., stated he was in support of Mr. Pettit's arguments. He feels the area could be developed as one family.

There were about 60 people in the audience interested in this Community Unit Plan.

Mr. Fink mentioned he thought the people in the area should be thanked for showing an interest in this matter.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-221-65

Community Unit Plan submitted by St. Vincent dePaul Society for property located at 4631 and 4706 S. Logan Street.

Mr. Ronald R. Gierthy, Staff Planner, presented an explanation of the site and the existing land use in the area. He explained the plan as recently revised.

Mr. Joseph O'Leary, representing the St. Vincent dePaul Society, stated that the society is aware of the real need for this type of development.

Mr. Floyd R. Decker, of 2905 N. Haggard Road Mason, asked Mr. O'Leary what he considered moderate rent. Mr. O'Leary replied that this would be under the control of the F.H.A. and would depend on construction costs. They are shooting for a price of about \$125.00 for four bedrooms. No specific price can be quoted at this time.

Mr. Glenn E. Townsend, of 4622 Burchfield Street, stated that at the last meeting with City Council they had indicated that occupants of the surrounding houses would be notified. His property is listed on the Assessor's records as being owned by a mortgage company. Mr. Townsend further asked the type of screening. Mr. Fink replied that the Staff would suggest, and the Board would take into consideration adequate screening to protect property owners in the surrounding area.

Mr. Townsend then discussed the topography. The houses on Burchfield are at least ten foot lower. He was concerned about the drainage. Further discussion of screening and fencing followed.

Mr. Richard Berry, 2415 Victor, asked if the project was tax exempt? Mr. O'Leary stated that the group would pay city taxes.

Mr. O'Leary further added that they had planned on a cyclone fence.

Mr. Townsend asked about the road, and was advised that it would be a publicly dedicated road.

Mr. Siebert mentioned that the reason for no screening to the north was because of the depth which is about 294 feet.

Mr. Fink mentioned that he thought the Board would go on record to the affect the lots to the north could be replatted and could be used for residential development.

Mr. Kenneth Brown, 921 Reo Road, asked if the property owners on the north will be paying for special assessments, and was advised that they would not. The project will assume the costs. Their plan is a good one and he is in favor of it.

There were 8 people in the audience interested in this project.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-154-66

Community Unit Plan submitted by Schaefer Realty for property located in the 100 and 200 blocks of E. Jolly Road.

Mr. Ronald R. Gierthy discussed the location of the site and the surrounding land use. He explained the plans as submitted by the developer.

Mr. Arthur Salk, Architect, appeared and advised that the original property optioned was to the west. Discussions with the Planning Staff resulted in the recommended exchange property to provide a buffer on the west. The elderly were to be located adjacent to the shopping center as recommended by the Federal government. He explained the plan including the elderly site.

Mr. Salk further discussed the number of apartments in the project and that they hoped to create a Georgetown atmosphere. They feel it should look as good as any private development being contiguous with a park and playground which will add to the environment. The buildings will be in small clusters. Setbacks will be well beyond requirements. Landscaping will be in the center of the groups of buildings. There will be no double sidewalks. Patios will be off the living rooms and they will

be screened. They hope this will be a landmark in public housing in Turnkey programs.

Mr. Reynolds questioned the housing for the elderly, and was advised that these are for people of low incomes. This is not a nursing home. The building is to be designed for single persons.

Mr. Salk then remarked that 2.5 acres are for a community building for regular family facilities. This will include a community room, kitchen and maintenance area.

Mr. Fink asked if the maintenance buildings were for a dual purpose and was advised that it is, however, the elderly building will have its own maintenance area for small items.

Mr. Fink asked if the maintenance area is perpetual and was advised that the Federal Government requires a minimum amount of square footage to be used for maintenance area. The local housing authority is responsible for maintaining the premises.

Mr. Fink asked about elevators, and was advised that there will be two, one for passengers only and the other will handle furniture, stretchers and passengers. The building will be fire proof and of brick exterior.

Mr. Floyd Decker asked the rent of each unit, and was advised that it is set by the local housing authority. Mr. Salk informed that the buildings are built in agreement with the local and federal authorities and then turned over to the local authority.

A Mr. Taylor, who said he lived on Northrup, asked where streets enter or leave Cedar or Jolly. Some discussion followed on where the various street outlets could be placed.

Mr. Floyd Decker discussed his subdivision to the south and his concern. He detailed his complaints of the city government.

Mr. Fink asked where this subdivision was, and was informed that it is at the end of Redner St., south of the Consumers Power right-of-way.

A Mr. Redick, who stated he lived on LeGrand, (no listing in the telephone book or city directory) advised that he is not personally involved, but would take an exception to Mr. Deckers accusations and mentioned the poor conditions of some of the houses.

Mr. Ron Decker, of 1030 E. St. Joseph Street, reported that he had lived at this address for the past year and mentioned the conditions of some of the homes and the disgraceful care given to some of the buildings.

Mr. William Mateer, Housing Director,

reported that in the event these are built and approved, they would be turned over to the Housing Commission. He believes many former problems have been in management. This is unpleasant. For the 80 homes they manage, all rent has been collected so far. There have been no serious complaints.

Mr. Gale L. Box, of 4635 Ora St., mentioned it seems like they have placed all the low income into one group. He felt they should be mixed throughout the city. He opposed the project.

Mr. Mateer advised that they want no more than 50 units per site, but the economical size is 100 for a developer. They now have sites in the northwest, one in the north central, they have 100 in the southwest, this one in the southeast and are negotiating in the northeast. They did not want them to be grouped together. They prefer to scatter them all over town, but this is economically impossible.

Mr. Alfred Williams, of 221 N. Walnut St., Associate Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity spoke. The Office of Economic Opportunity's primary business is to help remotivate people with confidence in themselves. We must solve the basic problems such as heat, water, and a roof over their heads before we can work with these people on education, re-training etc. There are 57 public and private agencies in this area working with people suffering deprivation. They must have facilities such as this. It is not good to put the problems of public housing on the social agencies. They want to see the citizens that do not have as much as we have mix with other people. We can't run from this sort of thing.

Mr. Anthony Shingle of 400 W. Jolly Road, mentioned that Cleveland had the same problem. He lived in an area such as this and after improvement there was no problem. Lansing can become a great city. These people have to live. Does not feel this development would hurt this section.

Mr. James Welton, of 4810 Ora St., stated he thought the duties of the Board are to protect the people already there. He built in good faith, about 8 years ago, and has his house about half paid for. He doesn't like the idea of public housing. He is willing to have one in his area, but not for 260 people. Thinks perhaps plans should be worked on somewhere. Feels it may devalue his property. He mentioned some houses where rent is low and they have been devaluated because of neglect.

Mr. Mateer reported that as an example, if there are 500 cases of family or individual need, they will have an administrative staff of 5 and a maintenance staff of 5. He will be the manager.

Mr. Alan Snow, 4811 Ora Street, wondered about the traffic problem of Jolly-Cedar, third worst in Lansing. There are no lights or sidewalk.

Mr. Snow asked if the plan can be reversed, and was advised that the City and the Board of Education preferred this. The traffic problem will be worked on.

Mr. Harold Davis, realtor, advised that they are involved in this site. He presented the background and how they became involved. He further mentioned the numerous meetings he and members of his staff attended. He felt there will be more architectural merit in this group of buildings, than in any building in that area whether it is commercial or residential. They want to be sure that every suggestion or requirement of the professional staff was worked in the project so that it would be a thing of beauty. They do not subscribe to the theory that senior citizens should be housed back of the yards. They do not think low income families should be denied the beauty, etc. that others enjoy. He asked the Board to recommend that this become a part of the city.

Mr. Keith Hamilton, of 5436 S. Cedar, stated he did not believe people can come in and out of there. He mentioned the traffic problems with the existing streets in the area. He mentioned that Jolly-Cedar is one of the worst corners. Older people should be protected and this corner is not a place for them.

Mr. Floyd Decker, went on at great length on the problems he anticipated in the area.

A Reverend Erwin Robertson, 320 Redner St., advised that he had worked with deprived people for ten years. He feels they should be put with people of higher standards. Clustering will create problems. New houses cost \$15,000.

Mr. Harold Davis, countered that 150 units for senior citizens and 100 units for low income families will not be many in total. He could not believe that all low income children are delinquents. He will do all he can for all segments of the society. He is opposed to any forced housing whatsoever. This will be well maintained. They are of the opinion that a project of this nature, in which so much thought and study has gone into, will not have a detrimental affect on the City of Lansing.

Mr. Robertson then added that he felt this is a moral issue.

Mr. Don Fisher, 308 Redner St., asked if this development is approved, what will become of this area? Will he have a neighborhood of apartments? He would like to see single family houses go into the area and develop as originally planned.

Mr. T. Ben Canady of the Cristo Rey Community Center, stated he was disturbed by the comments being made. He spoke of the background and work of the people in the center. They have 800 families. Many of them have got together and spent a lot of time working on houses, making

them livable. He mentioned his past experience in working with these groups and working on repairing houses.

Mr. Floyd Alden, 4916 Ora, asked about spreading out the 100 units. Mr. Salk, answered that the government establishes the cost and the cost goes up tremendously if spread out. Their operation has been that if the children or parents do not have they are removed from the center. They must abide by the rules and regulations within the community, or they do not have the facilities available to them. There are 36 acres adjoining. There is a marvelous outlet for these children.

Another party asked why the senior citizens, the school and the park were together? Mr. Salk, replied the federal government requests that they must be in the community. They must be within walking distance of shopping and where transportation is available. They are not a nuisance. They don't own cars and do not drive, however, parking is provided for visitors.

Mr. Mateer mentioned that a junior high and elementary school was planned for the area, before they were interested in the property.

Mr. Fink asked if one-half a parking space is sufficient for the senior citizens, and Mr. Salk replied that the opinion of the federal government is that they have very few cars. Their children will pick them up and drive them around. Their age and physical condition do not warrant driving. Additional parking can be provided at a later date if needed.

Mr. Kirchbar, of 5840 Schaefer St. (not listed in the telephone or the city directory) asked about discipline. Mr. Mateer advised that they have a three page lease and he invited Mr. Kirchbar or anyone else interested to read it. It was prepared by the City Attorney.

Further discussion was held on the dis-possession and how it was enforced.

Mr. Mateer discussed details of the 221 d-3 program and remarked that it is 100% federally financed.

Dr. S. A. Belding, Veterinarian, from 5325 S. Cedar St., stated that he was opposed because somebody is making money on this.

Mr. Heino, mentioned the comparison of the concern for this tonight, and that of only 21% of the people who voted at the polls the day before.

Mr. Claude J. Robinson, of 5634 Schaefer St., stated this is classed as one family. He is opposed to this being approved and also to the people.

Mr. Clyde (?) of 302 Northrup, (not listed in City Directory) stated that he was transferred to Lansing two years ago.

He found a house and felt this was his type of environment. This area will grossly effect his property. He made some suggestions and offered complaints about the bus service.

Mr. William W. Pittman, 125 Northrup, stated that public housing will drop the value of his house. He lives close to this. He paid \$600 in taxes, but doesn't want to pay this amount if the value is decreased.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Recess from 10:00 to 10:30 P.M.

Mr. Siebert left the meeting because of ill health.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus, that the minutes of January 17th, 31st, and February 7th be approved.

Mr Fink asked for a clarification on the preliminary plat of Midstate Replat.

Mr Fountain stated that the hardback will be submitted at a later date. It has not been filed with Council yet.

Some discussion followed on the Board's action at the last meeting and the confusion as to whether or not it was a preliminary or final plat.

The tape is to be listened to again to ensure that all actions are recorded.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

SS-3-67

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend that City Council set a public hearing at which time they would consider amending Chapter 36, Code of Ordinance, of the City of Lansing, as follows:

Section 36-1. Definitions—To amend (16) to read:

"Family" an individual or two or more persons related by blood, marriage or adoption together with not more than two (2) other persons, or a group of not more than three (3) persons, who need not be related by blood, marriage or adoption, living together as a single housekeeping unit in a dwelling unit.

The Board suggested that the required public hearing be set for:

Tuesday, March 21, 1967

7:30 P.M. Court Room No. 1

Sixth Floor, City Hall

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

S-2-65P Prawdzik Subdivision

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that a public hearing be set for preliminary plat for March 7th, 1967 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1. This subdivision submitted by Ted Prawdzik is located at 3181 W. Mt. Hope Avenue.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

S-18-66P Industrial Acres Subdivision

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that a public hearing be set for the preliminary plat submitted by Schaefer Realty, for property located at Jolly and Aurelius Roads on March 7th, 1967 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1, 6th Floor of City Hall.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-188-65

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board consider the referral from City Council, requesting that the Kahres Farm Community Unit Plan located at 6326 S. Cedar St. be reopened, and that Parcel "B" be rezoned to permit a total of 750,000 sq. ft. commercial.

The Planning Board recommends that this request be approved, on the basis of zoning the land to "F" commercial and "J" parking, with a parking ratio of three (3) sq. ft. of parking area to one (1) sq. ft. of gross floor area, with site plans and land description being furnished by the developer prior to final approval by the City Council.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-193-66

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Robert E. Savage, to rezone a parcel in the 2800 and 2900 block Averill Drive described as:

Lots numbered 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 180, 181, 182, 197 and 198 Scotsdale Subdivision No. 2,

from "A" one family to "C" two family district be denied as filed and that

Lots 74 through 78, Scotsdale Sub-division No. 2, City of Lansing,

be rezoned from "A" one family to "C" two family and

Lots 180, 181, 182, 197 and 198, Scotsdale Subdivision No. 2,

remain in their present zoning classification. The Planning Board further recommends that

Lots 74 through 78

be divided into four Lots more equal in size which would provide for more land area and a lower density for the proposed use.

The Board, in making its recommendation, considered several factors that set this request apart from the usual two family rezoning.

The parcels requested for rezoning are surrounded on all sides by property owned and developed by the petitioner.

The lots proposed for two family zoning are more than double the area required by the present code for two family zoning. (4000 vs. 9000 and longer). These lots are 2500 feet larger than the Planning Board's recommendation for two family lots.

The two family at this location would serve as a step down in bulk from the multiple apartment complex adjacent and west of the requested zoning.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-221-65

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the Community Unit Plan by St. Vincent dePaul Society, represented by Joseph O'Leary, for a parcel at 4631 and 4705 S. Logan described as:

Commencing 80 rods N. and 20 rods W. of S.E. corner, Section 32, thence W. 60 rods, N. 8 rods, E. 60 rods, S. 8 rods to beginning. Section 32 (4631 S. Logan St.) Commencing 80 rods N. and 20 rods W. of S.E. corner, Section 32, thence W. 60 rods, S. 8 rods, E. 60 rods, N. 8 rods to beginning Section 32 (4705 S. Logan Street)

be approved subject to the following condition:

A dedicated public cul-de-sac street abut-

ting the property to the north be constructed with a 60 ft. R.O.W., 55 ft. radius on the cul-de-sac, and a pavement width of 36 ft. The developer (St. Vincent dePaul) will be required to post bond for the necessary cost of improvements.

That the developers furnish the City Council an outline of the management agreement for this project which includes the duties and responsibility of the manager.

That a landscaped plan be submitted and approved by the Planning Board prior to the issuance of the building permits.

That each parking space be a minimum of 9 feet by 20 feet and arranged as shown on the plan.

The street and apartment building locations be constructed to the dimensions as indicated on the site plan.

That final approval is valid for one year from the date of approval by the Lansing City Council.

Following a period of study by the Planning Staff and a public hearing held on February 21, 1967 it was found that:

The adjacent property would not be adversely affected.

The plan is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Zoning Code to promote public health, safety, morals and general welfare.

The buildings and structures shall be used only for community activities.

The policy of the Planning Board and City Council, except the Central City area, has been to maintain a density of 12 units per acre on outlying apartment developments when the site meets the recommended criteria.

The Zoning Committee further recommends the property to the north of the proposed street described as:

Lots 48, 49 and the South 148 ft. of Lots 37 through 45 Sonnenbergs Half Acre Subdivision, City of Lansing

be rezoned from "A" one family to "C" two family. The Committee believes that this will allow development compatible with the proposed development and the single family development to the north.

Mr. Fink questioned the "C" two family. Some discussion followed. Mr. Heino suggested that the addition be removed from the motion.

Mr. Reynolds asked why it would bother anyone?

Mr. Gaus stated he didn't think we should bother with this at all. He didn't feel we should give them "C" two.

Mr. Heino, added that one individual would like it to be "D-M".

Mr. Fountain suggested that the Board hold up until this is firmed more. A special hearing could be set up some time in the future.

Some discussion was held on what to tell the petitioner.

Mr. Reynolds suggested that the people should decide if they would like the "A" one family or the "C" two family.

Mr. Gaus mentioned that the developer might purchase.

Mr. Fountain added that the lots could not be built upon until the street is improved.

Mr. Reynolds remarked that the people should have a say in what the property could be used for.

Mr. Guernsey mentioned that there have been discussions with individuals who would like "D-M". The Staff would not recommend this, but would like to discuss this policy with the Board.

Mr. Reynolds stated that the people with lots abutting should be the only ones concerned, and the Board shouldn't consider any higher than the "C" two.

Mr. Gaus, asked who is filing, Mr. Guernsey answered an adjacent property owner.

Mr. Manz suggested that nothing be done until there is a street.

Mr. Heino thought the Staff should have an answer.

Some discussion followed on the Board's decision, and it was decided that the Committee recommendation be deleted from the recommendation to Council and considered at a later date.

Original motion, with the deletion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

SS-1-64 Washington Avenue Realignment

Mr. William D. Bechtel discussed the program to date.

Mr. Fink mentioned the commercial that had been approved in this Washington, Holmes area and the "Battle of the Barrels" that exists. He felt the Board has got to act now or it might be too late. Serious consideration should be given to a divided highway where Washington in-

tersects with Holmes because of the traffic generation. He felt the Board should recommend to City Council as soon as possible.

Mr. Reynolds asked if we should make a recommendation now, and Mr. Fink answered that he thought we should.

Mr. Fink believed that the recommendation of this artery would let any future developers know of the Boards plan.

Mr. Bechtel mentioned the possibilities for extensions to the south. Plans of the Traffic Board were explained and the proposed plan of obtaining land to the north of the present Holmes on the Tepsich property.

Some discussion followed on the time factors involved.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the straightening of Washington to Holmes would help now, and was advised that the Traffic would not recommend it at this time.

Mr. Fink asked the Staff to try prepare a plan and recommendation for the Board.

Mr. Fink further asked to be allowed to serve on the Streets Committee to help solve this problem and was granted permission.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus, that the matter be referred to the Streets Committee and further study for not less than sixty days.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Fink asked about the Mid State Replat and was advised that it will be considered at the next meeting.

BUILDINGS AND PROPERTIES

BP-18-66 State Capitol Building

Motion by Manz, seconded by Heino, that the Board recommend to Governor Romney that the Lansing Planning Board at their regular meeting on February 21, 1967, consider the proposals for the restoration, expansion, or the building of a new State Capitol building. The Planning Board recommends that Proposal C as outlined in the study by Smith, Hinchman and Orylls, Detroit architectural firm, entitled "State Capitol of Michigan—A Study of its Restoration and Expansion" be implemented.

In forwarding this recommendation the Board considered the 1922 Master Plan and the 1938 Master Plan for the City of Lansing as developed by the firm of Harlan Bartholomew and Associates, St. Louis Missouri, the report by Smith, Hinchman and Grylls as previously mentioned, and various studies and recommendations from individuals representing the arts and rec-

ommendations of various citizens of the State, as were available to the Board.

Copies of various recommendations and thoughts on this matter as have been obtained by the Planning Board are included for your perusal.

And an information letter be sent to the City Council advising them of the letter to Governor Romney.

Mr. Fink suggested that the recommendation be amended to read "Plan C" or the alternative of actually tearing down the building giving flexible approval to it.

Mr. Reynolds remarked that he doesn't work in the building and doesn't feel he is qualified to make a decision.

Mr. Fink stated he felt the city should give some sense of direction. It is the Board's responsibility to make a recommendation on what should happen to the State Capitol.

Further discussion followed on what should be included in the motion.

Mr. Fink rescinded his amendment.

Original motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Reynolds, that if the plan "C" is not being approved utilized, that the present Capitol structure be demolished and a new functionally designed building be considered on the site.

Some discussion followed on the height of the new structure.

Mr. Fink contended that the Capitol should be a dominant feature of the City.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yea: Fink and Reynolds—2.

Nays: Bretz, Gaus, Heino, and Manz—4.

Mr. Reynolds asked about the front yard parking and wondered if this shouldn't be added.

Mr. Gaus, asked if we had to make a recommendation at this time and Mr. Guernsey informed the Board that the Governor had asked for the recommendation.

SS-1-67

Master Plan Residential Density Updat-

ing in the southeast area will be ready for the March 7th meeting.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds reported that Carl Johnson will present a design study that has been made on the project, particularly the mall, at the Urban Renewal Board meeting on Thursday. He thought maybe, the Board might be interested in attending.

ORDINANCE

SS-20-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that Chapter 36, Code of Ordinances, be amended by adding a paragraph to Section 36-40 "I" Heavy Industrial District, to read:

(14) Stone mill, quarry, the extraction of sand, gravel, turf or the removal of overburden which will in any way alter the surface of the land, except for the removal of materials from basement, public service or utility excavations, common household gardening and the care and improvement of lawns or the development of public rights-of-way.

The Planning Board at their meeting of February 7, 1967 held a public hearing. The hearing did not produce any public testimony regarding this proposed zoning amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Guernsey mentioned he would like to commend Mr. Alan E. Tubbs and his wife for the work involved in the preparation of this report. He believes it is the best turned out to date. It is a good working tool. It is very accurate and straight forward in its presentation.

Mr. Fink, asked if Council hasn't approved a study of the downtown area by E. A. Barton and Associates and Mr. Guernsey advised he will check.

Mr. Bechtel mentioned the Traffic Department has requested information on where to start a traffic study.

FINANCE

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus, that \$841.83 be transferred from the 102 290

account to the 170 122 part time help account. This money was a reimbursement for work done by the Staff for Federal Housing projects.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Zoning map data will be forwarded and the full explanation discussed at the next meeting.

The Traffic Board meeting has been confirmed for March 14th.

Mrs. Arlene E. O'Donnell has submitted her resignation and it has been accepted with regret.

OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The letter from the Michigan Welfare League is to be Xeroxed and sent to the members of the Board.

NEW BUSINESS

The Zoning Policy around Community College will be ready for discussion later in March.

Meeting adjourned at 12:00 midnight.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

TC

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, March 7, 1967

Meeting was called to order at 7:44 P.M.
by Chairman Ramona Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus,
Heino and Reynolds—6.

Absent: Manz and Siebert—2.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

S-2-65P Prawdzik Subdivision, submitted
by Ted Prawdzik, for property at 3131 W.
Mt. Hope Avenue.

D. Gregory Main, Planner, discussed location, land use, and the proposed development of the property. Mr. Prawdzik was present and stated he had nothing more to add.

Mr. Black, asked that if because of the different ownership there was no outlet to Mt. Hope Avenue? Mr. Main replied no, but that the developer has indicated that Deerfield could be extended through or stubbed to the west. The Staff believes that the street should be a direct extension of Deerfield Avenue. This would allow the street to be stubbed to the west. Mr. Black stated that this is all on different ownership of property so there is no assurance that it could ever be carried out.

Mr. Guernsey, stated that the only assurance would be that when the land is subdivided, the City Council and the Planning Board have a responsibility to see that the street arrangements are contiguous and that the streets do extend.

Mr. Reynolds asked how deep are the proposed lots on the east side of Deerfield? Mr. Main replied 120 feet.

Mrs. Bretz, stated that Deerfield runs right along the edge of the developer's property. Mr. Main stated that the developer proposes to extend it north and swing it over to his property line.

Mr. Reynolds asked how deep the lots would be on the developer's plat, and was told 180 feet.

Mr. Gaus asked if the lots on the west side of the street could be developed at this time? Mr. Main replied that they would have to be developed in conjunction with this other land.

Mr. Gordon Kruger, whose mother owns the property adjacent and west of the proposed subdivision, stated that it was his understanding that the lots were supposed to be 160 feet in depth which would leave a 20 foot strip. Mr. Main replied that the total width is 240 ft., that the city standards require 66 ft. from the street so the remainder would be the property in question. Mr. Kruger stated that the developer proposed to use his entire land and that he was not aware that there was anyone interested.

There were five people present interested in this matter.

Matter referred to the Streets Committee.

S-18-66P Industrial Acres, submitted by Schafer Realty for property at Jolly and Aurelius Roads.

D. Gregory Main, Planner, discussed the location, land use, and the proposed development of the property.

Mr. Harold Davis stated that the developer was unable to be present for the meeting.

Mr. Reynolds asked if this would be "A" one family? Mr. Main, replied that it would be industrial. It is presently zoned "I" heavy industrial with the exception of the Consumers Power right-of-way, which is zoned single family.

Mr. Fred Olson, 5002 Boettcher Court, asked what was proposed to be developed on the property? Mr. Main replied, that there is a wide variety of uses allowed in industrial but that at present he was told the developer wishes to build a warehouse. Mr. Olson then asked how much right-of-way Consumers has, and Mr. Main replied 165 ft.

Mrs. Nash, 4921 Boettcher Court, stated that she lived at the very end of the Court and wanted to know what was going to go

in back of the Court? Mr. Main, replied that the proposed development is entirely south of Jolly Road and at the present time there are no plans for the area she is concerned about.

Mrs. Nash stated that there were nice homes on the Court and she is concerned about their property value.

Mr. Fink stated that the land directly adjacent west to Boettcher Court is zoned "A" one family and this would give you some security in the direct area concerned

This matter referred to the Streets Committee.

Z-12-67

Mr. Gary Stowe, appeared on behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 3814 Donald Street, from "A" one family to "C" two family. Mr. Stowe stated he planned to build two-family homes for private use. By building a nice house I am hoping to evaluate other property around there.

Mr. Black asked if there would be three two-family houses on this site or one two-family house, and Mr. Stowe replied there would be just one two family house on one lot.

Mr. Gaus asked the size of the lot? Mr. Stowe stated it was 61 ft. x 96 ft., and that he was in the middle of the block.

The matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-13-67

Mr. Elton Tubbs, appeared on behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 2009 W. Holmes Road, from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling. He stated he is the owner of property and the present plans call for a twelve unit dwelling. Lot size is 30,550 sq. ft. He also stated that the homes across Holmes St. have all been sold and he thought there was going to be a professional building there.

Mrs. Bretz, stated that this property at 2009 W. Holmes Road (Z-13-67) and the property adjacent which is 2013 W. Holmes Road (Z-14-67), are two separate petitions under different ownerships.

The matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-14-67

Mr. Morris Albertson, appeared on behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 2013 W. Holmes St., from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple.

Mr. Leonard Simms, officer of Simkin Corporation and developer of the Community Unit Plan of Simkin Village which partially surrounds these proposed rezonings, stated he was not prepared to either approve or protest at this point. Mr. Simms, stated he has gone to good deal of expense putting in a road in Simkin area, sewers, platting, and still developing property under Community Unit Plan, and would like to have some assurance that the contiguous property that is in question and to the east of us along Holmes Road does not have something that is inconsistent with the beauty we hope to create in the village. We assumed the Holmes Road buffer area would be professional community services along the road. We have no specific objections to these proposed rezonings providing they do not have something that will not upset the neighborhood that we are trying to create, or something that they may have in the way of density that we will have too.

Mr. Black questioned if the allowable density would be different? Mr. Guernsey replied that the developing Community Unit Plan was approved requiring a maximum density of 12 units per acre. The "D-M" zoning as requested in the petitions would allow a density of 28 units per acre.

Mr. Gaus asked what type of unit Mr. Albertson intended to put on his site?

Mr. Albertson stated that at the present time he had no particular plans in mind. There is a ten foot easement for a driveway for the people behind me. My property adjoins professional building.

The matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Mr. Anthony P. Nosal, stated he would like to make a few comments. I do not own any property within 300 feet of these proposed rezonings. We must extend our thinking to this: Holmes Road is no longer a residential street. We should strive to get the highest and most potential use of any land on Holmes Road for a tax base. You are familiar with Maloney and Holmes Road under the old "D-M" multiple where there were allowed 29 families on 170 ft. x 170 ft. which your Staff did not recommend, and your Planning Board recommended to be denied, but the Council did pass. That is an awful monstrosity of 29 families on that corner, with improper setback and very poor planning. With reference to what the request here, in all fairness to the applicant, under the new zoning ordinance I believe for the betterment of Lansing that this should be considered and allowed. There is enough room, he has the square feet, and under the new ordinance it would not overcrowd, the only thing to be careful of this if it is allowed, is to get the proper setback. I want to go on record as stating that this should be allowed, Lansing does need tax base and in all fairness to the applicant's here I don't think that on these large lots the density under "D-M" is too great, and

this should be given some consideration by your Board.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-15-67

No one appeared in favor or in opposition to the petition to rezone the property at 3500 block of N. East Street, from "A" one family to "F" commercial and "J" parking district.

Mr. Fountain stated that the property owner called and because of health reasons he would not be able to attend the meeting. This petition was initiated by the Planning Board.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-16-67

No one appeared in favor or in opposition to the petition to rezone the property at 4301 S. Pennsylvania Avenue, from "F" commercial to "E-2" drive-in shop.

Mr. Gaus asked what the object is in changing this zoning to "E-2"? Mr. Guernsey replied that it is to change the zoning so it is the same for all the service stations at this intersection.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-17-67

Mr. Box, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone the property at 5334 S. Cedar Street, from "D" apartment to "D-M" multiple.

Mr. Box stated that he can't see putting any multiple dwellings on Cedar Street. There would be a greater traffic hazard, especially since this is a bad corner.

Mr. Floyd Decker, stated that he thought this same property tied in with a zoning matter on the 100 and 200 block of Jolly Road on public housing. He thought there was a street supposed to come out through this same area and asked if this could be clarified?

Mr. Fountain showed the sketch and explained that there were two different developers.

Mr. Gaus stated that it is now zoned "D" apartment and the change requests "D-M" multiple. What is the difference in density? Mr. Fountain replied that the maximum density is 29 for "D-M" multiple and it is roughly 45 for "D" apartment. Mr. Gaus then asked what is the lot size. Mr. Guern-

sey replied that the entire parcel is 5.9 acres.

Mr. Decker asked who owned the portion where the proposed road is located? Mr. Fountain stated that Mr. Granger owns the property to the north of the road and another individual owns the property south of the proposed road.

Mr. Reynolds asked Mr. Decker what he would think if Jolly Road instead of Cedar St. was used for this road, and he replied that any place close to the corner of Jolly and Cedar is bad. This is one of the worst corners in the city.

James Welton, 4810 Ora St. presented a petition to the Board. 1,517 signatures gathered in area between Holmes Road on the north, Northrup St. on the south, S. Cedar on the east, and Logan and Washington on the west. There are a few signatures out of this area. Mr. Welton, then read the petition to the Board. He was told that the petition would be forwarded to the City Council.

William Pittman, 125 Northrup St., appeared and stated that it was his understanding that a school was supposed to go in east of the Bell Telephone Company. Mr. Reynolds stated that the school was supposed to go in next to the shopping center, but by swapping property they moved the school west so the Schafer development would go between the school and the shopping center.

Mr. Decker stated that he thought the petition spoke for itself, that everybody in the area is against this public housing. This area was set up for "A" one family and we believe it should stay this way.

The matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-18-67

Dr. Robert June appeared on behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 423 W. Ionia St., from "D-M" multiple to "D-1" professional. Dr. June stated that this would be a second office. My practice would be split, one office on Ionia for private patients, and the other one on Walnut for industrial patients. The size of the building and lot are shown on the Board's sketch. There is more than ample room for off-street parking. The ground floor would be professional office use and the second floor for filing and non-professional office space. This would be close enough to permit me to be able to handle an increased patient load. It would also relieve our parking problem. As far as I know there are no objections from surrounding property owners.

Mr. Gaus questioned whether the Industrial patients would also need off-street parking, and Dr. June replied that they are

most often brought to the office by company vehicle or taxicab.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-19-67

Mr. Bernard LaDuke, appeared on behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 6070 S. Logan Street, from "A" one family to "F" commercial. He stated that he had owned this property for about 20 years. It was zoned commercial when I bought it and has been used commercially for about the last 15 years. Part of it is leased out to Tastee Freeze. It is leased as commercial. Due to being annexed to the City we lost our commercial rating. All I am trying to do is get this property zoned back to what it was zoned. It is not being developed into anything larger now. It has a beauty shop and the tastee freeze on it right now, and I don't plan any larger development for a while.

No one appeared in opposition to this petition.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-20-67

No one appeared either for or against the petition to rezone property located at 732-738 N. Pennsylvania Avenue, from "C-2" family to "D-1" professional.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-21-67

Mr. Howard Alexander, appeared on behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 3323 N. East Street, from "A" one family to "F" commercial and "J" parking. The only reason he wants to rezone the property is that it is now "A" one family and he wants more parking space. Patrons sometimes park on neighbors lawns in the area which causes problems in the neighborhood.

Mr. Reynolds asked who own the residence immediately west of this property, and Mr. Alexander stated that people by the name of Crosby own it.

Mrs. Bretz, asked if their house was close to his lot, and he replied that the two lots are side by side. The garage would be on the southwest corner of the lot.

Mr. Reynolds stated that he was thinking about the patrons parking next to this house late at night. Mr. Alexander stated there wouldn't be much difference than

what there is right now, except that the house that he owns would be coming out.

Mr. Fink asked where he proposed to put the storage building? Mr. Alexander replied that it would be on the southwest corner. Mr. Fink then asked how much land area he thought he needed for that structure, and was told that the garage would be either 20 x 20 ft. or 24 x 20 feet located about 30 feet from the corner. Mr. Alexander then presented his building plans to the Board.

Further discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-22-67

Mrs. LaVern D. Peterman, appeared on behalf of the petition to rezone property in the 2100-2200 block of Hamelon St., from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling. Mrs. Peterman stated that she is the owner of the Hamelon Subdivision, Green Meadows. She feels that "A" one residential is no longer desirable. Since there are other petitions on file for this immediate neighborhood for commercial she wishes her property rezoned as well.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-23-67

Mr. Frank L. Cook, appeared on behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 3804 S. Pennsylvania Avenue, from "A" one family to "F" commercial. Mr. Cook stated that he would like his property zoned commercial.

Mr. Heino asked what Mr. Cook was going to put in the property, and he replied printing. He then asked if Mr. Cook had petitioned about a year ago, Mr. Cook replied that he did.

Mr. Reynolds asked if he lived and also had the business on the property? Mr. Cook stated that he did and that he would like a sign for his business.

Mr. Guernsey commented that the City had ordered Mr. Cook to remove his press because the use is not proper in the present zoning. The only way he could keep the press in the house is if the land was rezoned.

Mr. Reynolds stated that then it is not just a question of the sign but also the equipment in the house.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-24-67

Mr. Donald Hines, Attorney for General Motors, appeared on behalf of the petition to rezone:

I. The following described property from "H" light industrial to "I" heavy industrial district:

- a. Lots 1 to 10 inclusive, Block 4, Albert E. Cowles Subdivision of Block 19 of Townsend's Subdivision of the North part of Section 20, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, EXCEPTING THEREFROM, those portions thereof occupied by the Lansing Manufacturers Railroad right-of-way and by the Grand Trunk Western Railroad Company right-of-way.
- b. Lots 1 to 6, inclusive, Block 3, Albert E. Cowles Subdivision of Block 19 of Townsend's Subdivision of the North part of Section 20, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, EXCEPTING THEREFROM, those portions thereof occupied by the Lansing Manufacturers Railroad right-of-way, and by the Grand Trunk Western Railroad Company right-of-way.

II. TO RE-ZONE the following described property from "F" commercial district to "I" heavy industrial district:

- a. Lots 1, 2, 7 and 8, Block 1, Albert E. Cowles Subdivision of Block 19 of Townsend's Subdivision of the North part of Section 20, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan.

III. TO RE-ZONE the following described property from "J" parking district to "I" heavy industrial district:

- a. Lots 3, 4, 5, and 6, Block 1, Albert E. Cowles Subdivision, of Block 19 of Townsend's Subdivision of the North part of Section 20, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan.
- b. All of Block 2, Albert E. Cowles Subdivision of Block 19 of Townsend's Subdivision of the North part of Section 20, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, EXCEPTING THEREFROM, that parcel described as, The North 90 feet of the West 10 feet of Lot 3 and the East 28 feet of the North 90 feet of Lot 4 and the North 60 feet of the West 38 feet of Lot 4, Block 2, said Albert E. Cowles Subdivision, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan.

IV. TO ZONE the following described vacated streets to "I" heavy industrial district:

- a. All that part of vacated Albert Street lying between the East right-of-way

line of Birch Street (on the west) and the West right-of-way line of Logan Street (on the east), City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan.

b. All that part of vacated Cowles Street lying between the South right-of-way line of Olds Avenue (on the north) and the Northern line of the Grand Trunk Western Railroad Company right-of-way (on the south), City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan.

c. All that part of vacated Birch Street lying between the South right-of-way line of Albert Street (on the North) and the Northern line of the Lansing Manufacturers Railroad right-of-way (on the South), City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan.

V. TO REZONE the following described property from "B" residence district to "I" heavy industrial district:

- a. A parcel of land located in Block 2, Albert E. Cowles Subdivision of Block 19 of Townsend's Subdivision of the North part of Section 20, T4N, R2W, described as follows: Beginning on the North line of Lot No. 4, Block 1, said Albert E. Cowles Subdivision, at a point 41 feet Easterly from the Northwest corner of said Lot No. 4, running thence Easterly on the South line of Olds Avenue a distance of 35 feet, thence South 90 feet parallel with Birch Street, thence West 38 feet, thence North 30 feet, thence West 38 feet to Birch Street, thence North 10 feet, thence East 41 feet on a line parallel with the North line of said Lot 4, thence North 50 feet to the point of beginning, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan.

Mr. Hines stated that the entire area indicated in the sketch is actually a series of four blocks together south of Olds Avenue. He then presented a composite survey to the Board of the area, giving an explanation of the survey. The piece of property not owned by General Motors is a relatively small piece owned by grocery store. General Motors is contemplating a paint repair building on the proposed rezoning site. Mr. Hines stated that there are some rather sizable pieces owned by the railroads. We don't represent the railroads and we did not go to the railroads but currently their parcels are in light industrial and for that reason, we would like to request that if you feel our request has merit and you would recommend the heavy industrial classification, that you also give some thought to recommending those parcels that we have excepted from our descriptions also be placed in the industrial classification.

Mr. Fink asked about the area vacated on Birch Street. Would this effect the extension or the development of the oneway traffic pattern or the bridge proposed for Birch St. for the relocation of traffic problems in the southwest part of the City?

Mr. Guernsey stated that portions of Birch Street is within the land area proposed for the bridge to come across. Preliminary construction plans are in the Public Service Department.

Mrs. Bretz asked if Oldsmobile was aware of this? Mr. Hines stated that both at the city and highway level consultation has taken place with Oldsmobile people to discuss the conveniences or inconveniences to those concerned of the routes to be taken in this area.

Further discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-25-67

Mr. Louis Husband, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property located at 716 and 800 W. St. Joseph St., from "C" two-family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Mr. Husband stated that he thought the rezoning was justified since it falls within the City's Master Plan. Wants to move onto this property a 7 unit apartment house.

Mr. Guernsey asked if there was a certain time limit in which the building had to be moved?

Mr. Husband replied that the building had to be moved from property two blocks east on Chestnut St. within 60 days.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Mrs. Nash, who lives at 4921 Boettcher Court, asked for the Board's help in regard to the problem of Sycamore Creek overflowing into her yard, which ruins the grass and flowers. She tried to get the Capitol Development Company, who owns the property from Aurelius Road to Standard Block and Supply, to come out and clean it up. Mrs. Bretz suggested she go to the Public Service Department, but Mrs. Nash said that she had gone to them and nothing was done. Mrs. Bretz told her that the Board would find out and get in touch with her as where she can get help. Mrs. Nash also stated that Standard Block and Supply Company dumps into the creek which blocks it so that it overflows.

Mr. Anthony Nosal, 2323 W. Holmes Road, requested a few words before the Board went into their business session. I am a stresser of consistencies. I am confused since the Planning Board tentatively approved the Central City Master Plan revision and are now functioning under it. When you immediately get a request for a zoning contrary to the Master Plan, I don't understand why when the Planning

Staff recommends on a piece of property (Z-202-66), which is in this Capitol Development area, that "The principal guidelines of the Central City Development Plan should be followed." I agree that you possibly will veer from this from time to time, but being one of the first test cases I don't think it was proper for the Board to send recommendation to Council with no vote, no contest. I don't think that is democracy.

Recess from 9:28 to 9:50 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Reynolds, supported by Heino, that the minutes of February 7, 1967, as corrected be approved.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

S-2-67P

Motion by Gaus, supported by Black, that a public hearing be set on the Preliminary Plat of Delaware Park, for April 4, 1967 in Court Room No. 1, 6th Floor, City Hall.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Rules suspended to permit presentation on Master Plan by Mr. William Bechtel.

SS-1-67

Mr. William Bechtel, discussed the purposes, revisions and conclusions on the Master Plan residential density updating in the southeast area.

Mr. Guernsey pointed out that this presentation is preliminary, that a detailed analysis and report form would be completed.

He also stated that the necessity here is to establish a policy for land development. Since the bond issue was defeated money for storm drains for that area is not available. We are now installing sanitary sewers. Unless money is acquired we will be unable to move ahead with our public responsibility.

Mr. Fink, asked what happens to the state development on the proposed sites? Will these be curtailed because of lack of storm sewer facilities? Mr. Guernsey, stated that they have their own natural drainage to the biological study area at the present time which would permit them to continue with construction. However, we will not be able to extend any storm sewers to those sites.

Further discussion followed.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-154-66

Motion by Fink, supported by Heino, that the petition by Harold M. Davis, to rezone a parcel in the 300 Block of West Jolly Road described as:

The North 15 acres of the Southeast quarter of the Northwest quarter of Section 4, Town 3 North, Range 2 West, and also the Northeast quarter of the Northeast quarter of Section 4 Town 3 North, Range 2 West, except a parcel in the Northwest corner thereof 132 feet East and West by 330 feet North and South, and a parcel in the Northeast corner thereof 132 feet East and West by 330 feet North and South,

from "A" one residential district to a Community Unit Plan, be tabled not more than 30 days, because of the petition filed at Planning Board meeting 3/7/67 containing 1,500 signatures in opposition to this petition.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-184-66

Motion by Fink, supported by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Leo A. Farhat, Attorney, acting for Warner and Long Realty Company, to rezone a parcel at 3328 W. Jolly Road, from "A" one residential to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied as filed, and that the property be rezoned from "A" one family to "C" two-family district.

The Board believes that this use will allow reasonable development of the land, with minimum adverse affects on the adjacent single family residential development.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-188-66

Motion by Fink, supported by Heino, that the petition by Thayer Winegardner, H. Burdette Bottom, Homer Winegardner, to rezone a parcel at 1800 and 1900 blocks Hoyt Street (between Aurelius and Ruth Streets) described as:

Lots 36, 37, 38, 61, 62, 63 of Good homes Subdivision, City of Lansing

from "A" residential to "D-M" multiple be tabled until funds or facilities for storm sewers for the area be made available. In view of preliminary presentation of amendment to Master Plan the concept arrange-

ment of plans is satisfactory, but at this time no facilities exist for adequate removal of storm water and natural drainage.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-192-66

Motion by Fink, supported by Gaus, that the petition by John A. Tysman, President of Estate Property Purchasers Investors Co., Inc., to rezone a parcel at 3206 Aurelius Road, from "A" one residential to Community Unit Plan be tabled indefinitely until facilities for storm sewers for the area be available.

Mr. Guernsey asked if the term "tabled indefinitely" meant that if the City is able to obtain method of financing to handle storm drains than the petition would move forward and Mr. Fink assured him that was what he meant.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-199-66

Motion by Fink, supported by Heino, that the petition by John L. Cote, Attorney for Robert Ridenour, Trustee for Jehovah's Witnesses, to rezone a parcel at 3615 W. Jolly Road, from "A" one family to "B" one family and "J" parking be tabled.

Motion by Fink, supported by Reynolds, that the rules be suspended to give Mr. Cote an opportunity to speak on behalf of the petition.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Cote stated that there was a question raised in regard to the description which he submitted in his application. As it turned out there were 78 feet of that lot and the description was corrected by direct communication to the Planning Department office.

Mr. Fink stated that it was the Zoning Committee's opinion that the splitting of the 78 foot lot was restrictive for the proposed development, and perhaps they would be receptive for a recommendation favorable to this if the balance of the lot were made available in the petition. We are speaking of the balance of Lot 39.

Mr. Cote stated that the seller of the property is not the owner of that balance of the property. My client is not in a position to acquire that additional 45 feet.

Mr. Fink stated that unless the site was expanded, the frontage along Jolly Road, we would be recommending adversely for the change in zoning. We could table this to explore it further.

Mr. Cote requested that the matter be tabled for 30 days in order that actual figures on acquisition could be determined, so that a final determination might be made of the financial and economic availability of that piece of property. If the additional 45 feet could be obtained, would this be sufficient to satisfy the Committee or is an even larger site in mind? Mr. Fink answered that he could not speak for the rest of the Committee but that it was felt that the 78 feet was restrictive. I think there might be a favorable response to the proposed zoning change with this additional footage. I can not guarantee it. Mr. Cote thanked the Board for their consideration and again asked that the matter be tabled.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-208-66

Motion by Fink, supported by Black, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by John Bondarenko, to rezone a parcel at 2920 S. Pleasant Grove Road, from "A" one family to Community Unit District be denied.

The development is contrary to the established land use pattern of the surrounding area, which is low density single family development.

The development would alter the population density pattern, thereby seriously increasing the load on public facilities and utilities.

Utilities for the area have been installed on the basis of single family development.

Schools in the area are now operating near capacity, and no funds appear to be available for construction of additional facilities.

The proposed change would adversely affect living conditions in the immediate area, principally through an increase in traffic and activity.

The change may adversely affect property values in the vicinity and may, therefore, deter the improvement or development of adjacent properties in accord with the existing regulations.

The change would allow structural development out of character with the adjacent single family development.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot develop under the existing zoning.

Mr. Gaus questioned item No. 3 in the Committee recommendation in regard to "protecting public health, safety, morals and general welfare?" Mr. Vernon Fountain stated that the increased density meant more traffic on the existing streets, decreas-

ing safety, encroachment on privacy of private homes, etc.

Mr. Fink stated that a higher density land use is what we are concerned with here. The total area is developed into single family residential development. It would not be conducive to maintain the character of the neighborhood.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None:

Z-1-67

Motion by Fink, supported by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Russell A. Koch, Jr. to rezone a parcel at 2727 Hollywood, from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling be denied as filed, and that the property be rezoned from "A" one family to "C" two-family district.

The proposed use will generate additional traffic and activity into the immediate single family area.

Zoning as requested could prompt further requests of this nature on the property to the north. The Board believes this should be discouraged, as it would be a direct encroachment into the existing single family development.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None:

Z-5-67

Motion by Fink, supported by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Gerald J. and Adelia M. Toman, to rezone a parcel at 5520 S. Cedar St. and vacant lot adjacent north described as:

Commencing at the middle point in the south line of the northeast $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 4, T3N, R2W, Township of Delhi, now City of Lansing, thence northerly 4 chains, thence south 62° west 8 chains 50 links to a post in the south line of said northeast $\frac{1}{4}$, thence east 7 chains 50 links to the place of beginning, except the south 117 feet thereof, and

That part of the northeast $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 4, T3N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, commencing at the south $\frac{1}{8}$ corner of said northeast $\frac{1}{4}$, thence N. $0^{\circ} 26' 30''$ east 264.0 feet at right angles to the east-west $\frac{1}{4}$ line of said Section 4, to the point of

beginning, thence south $62^{\circ} 22' 10''$ west 312.37 feet to a point 117.0 feet north of said east-west $\frac{1}{4}$ line, thence 275.62 feet parallel to said east-west $\frac{1}{4}$ line to the point of beginning, subject to rights-of-way of record.

from "A" one residential to "F" commercial district be denied.

The Master Land Use Plan does not propose commercial development at this location.

Zoning of the land would further extend the undesirable strip commercial development along this area of Cedar St., but more important would encourage commercial development directly into Northrup St., which is developed with single homes, and is the primary access to the residential development further west.

Zoning of the property would deter the improvement or development of the properties south and west of this site.

This property and the property south to Northrup could be developed in a residential nature. With proper screening and limited access on Cedar St., the adverse influences of this major street would be reduced. This would also preserve the residential character of the properties to the west.

Platting of the land in the immediate area should precede any further zoning or development.

Topography and existing tree growth on the site would be an asset to development for a residential nature.

Mr. Gaus asked what the Staff believed this should be zoned?

Mrs. Bretz replied that this is very high land and they can't get down to Cedar Street, they have to go out Northrup.

Mr. Fountain stated that this could possibly be used for multiple family development.

Mr. Fink stated that he thought this could be developed for higher intensity than "A" one family.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None:

Z-6-67

Motion by Fink, supported by Heino, that the Board recommend to the City Council that the petition by Joseph Lavey, to rezone a parcel at 411 West Ionia Street, from "D-M" multiple-dwelling to "D-1" professional offices district be granted.

The Central City Development Plan indicates the proposed use of this site for offices and services.

Development of offices within the proposed office area, as outlined in the Central City Plan, will discourage further scattering of this type of use throughout the areas proposed for high density residential, state offices, and high rise apartment development.

Zoning as requested requires off-street parking with the development.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None:

Z-7-67

Motion by Fink, supported by Gaus, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Arnold Kegebein, to rezone a parcel in the 117, 121, 129 E. St. Joseph and 616, and 618 S. Grand Avenue, described as:

Lots 3 and 4, Block 157, Original Plat

from "D" apartment to "E-2" drive-in district be denied.

The Central City Development Plan indicates the proposed use for this area as multiple dwelling.

Rezoning of the land would promote re-moval of five residential structures for a combined total of nine dwelling units. This would add to the city's acute housing shortage.

Zoning request such as this, which are contrary to the Central City Plan, may foster uncontrolled development within the planned area, and lead to undesirable mixed land use.

Ingress and egress to the site from Grand Ave., would create an undesirable traffic movement upon completion of the I-496 Expressway.

Land use controls within the Central City Development Plan were proposed to promote the most functional land use relationship possible, and to provide for the least amount of conflict of traffic flow. The Board believes that the proposed land use for this site as indicated on the Central City Plan does, in effect, provide for this and should be retained.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None:

Z-9-67

Motion by Fink, supported by Gaus, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Maurice K. Gamel and Richard J. Abood, to rezone a parcel in the W. of 3532 W. Jolly Road described as:

Commencing on Section line 1758.01 ft. West of South $\frac{1}{4}$ post Section 31 thence and North 300 ft. West 55 ft. South 300 ft., East 55 ft. to beginning; Section 31, T4N, R2W, also commencing on Section line 1703.1 ft. West of South $\frac{1}{4}$ post, Section 31, thence North 300 ft. West 55 ft. South 300 ft., East 55 ft. to beginning Section 31, T4N, R2W

from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple district be denied.

The change would be contrary to the established land use in the area, which is predominate single family residence.

The change would create an isolated district i.e., this would be a "spot-zone."

Where apartment zones abut single family development, the latter is subject to adverse influences such as; increased noise and activity, additional traffic and larger buildings.

The change will adversely affect property values in the immediate area and may, therefore, deter the improvement or development of adjacent properties, in accord with existing zoning.

There are several lots in the area, that would have to be given the same consideration if this lot were rezoned.

The proposal instead of adding tax base to the City of Lansing, may foster uncontrolled apartment development in this area, and lead to mixed and undesirable land uses, which would encourage blight and reduce the tax base of the area.

With cooperation between property owners, this property, and the property east and west could be fully developed in single family homes.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nay: None:

Z-10-67

Motion by Fink, supported by Gaus, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Norman J. Ellipper, Jr. to rezone a parcel at 1410 E. Kalamazoo Street, from "B" one family to "D-1" professional district be granted.

The site in question was considered by the Planning Board October 6, 1965 and

July 6, 1966. In both cases the requests were to permit commercial uses on the property, ranging from a used car lot, to small retail store, office, restaurant and other similar uses.

The request at this time is to allow professional office use on the site. The owner proposes to structurally alter the existing service station to conform more with existing residential development in the area. Parking and screening would be provided, and exterior advertising would be limited.

If the site is rezoned as requested, it will be necessary to vary the front yard parking requirements.

This will require a variance through the Board of Zoning Appeals, who may stipulate the screening and landscaping as shown on the plan submitted with this request.

The Board believes that the "D-1" office zone would promote reasonable redevelopment of the property with the least amount of adverse influences on adjacent properties.

Mr. Guernsey stated that this zoning request would require close review and consideration by the Board of Appeals to permit the use on the site. We have a problem, of an abandoned service station which is a blight and this particular developer has hired professional help in the form of an architect to rehabilitate a blighted structure which would fit better into the residential character of the area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nay: None:

Z-11-67

Motion by Fink, supported by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Robert C. June, to rezone a parcel at 403 N. Sycamore and 712 W. Shiawassee, described as:

E. $\frac{1}{2}$ rod of S. 8 rods Lot 2, Block 2, Claypool subd., also $2\frac{1}{2}$ rods of Lots 5 and 6, Block 76, Original plat and the S. 19 ft. of the East $7\frac{1}{2}$ rods of Lot 5, and the East $7\frac{1}{2}$ rods of Lot 6, Block 76 Original plat, City of Lansing

from "D-M" multiple to "D-1" professional office district be denied.

The site is within an area designated for residential use on the Central City Plan.

Indiscriminate spot zoning of residential property generally creates parking and incompatible land use relationship; stimulating further requests for marginal development, declining values in adjacent res-

idential properties and weakens the market potential of logical and desirable office areas.

There are several areas within the core area designated for office uses, and the petitioner should be encouraged to locate within those areas.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nay: None:

Z-25-67

Motion by Fink, supported by Gaus, that the rules be suspended to consider this petition on the agenda because of the urgency of the matter.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Fink, supported by Heino, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Andrew J. Husband, Jr. to rezone a parcel in the 716 and 800 W. St. Joseph Street, described as:

Lot 18 and E. 6 feet of Lot 17 of Block 6, of Bush, Butler and Sparrow's Addition to Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan and W. 60 ft. of Lot 17, Block 6 of Bush, Butler and Sparrow's Addition, City of Lansing

from "C" two family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be granted.

The Central City Plan proposes multiple family development for this site.

A change of zoning will permit the relocation of an apartment building which is in good condition, and provide some relief to the acute housing shortage, and for those families displaced by the I-496 Freeway system.

The site has ease of access to St. Joseph St., a traffic collector, and is within walking distance of some commercial facilities.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nay: None:

STREETS COMMITTEE

Sm-1-67

Motion by Gaus, supported by Black, that the application for division of Lot 111 Eco Farms, be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. All lots being graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.

2. Utility easements as may be required by the Board of Public Service and Board of Water and Light.

Variation from the recent resolution by City Council requiring 60 ft. lots is recommended for the following reasons:

1. The platted lots in this area are extremely large (104 ft. x 288 ft.) and many have been divided.

2. This lot has frontage on two streets.

3. The lots on either side have been divided similarly and developed with single family homes.

4. Approval of this request would allow new development which could upgrade the area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nay: None:

S-16-66F

Motion by Gaus, supported by Black, that the final plat of Bradley Hills be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. All public improvements shall be installed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewers, storm sewers, and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks, and such other improvements as required under Section VI D of Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

2. The posting of financial security in the amount to be determined by the Board of Public Service.

3. Installation of all required monuments.

4. A plat restriction prohibiting access to Waverly Road from residential lots shall appear on the face of the plat.

5. All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Acts of 1929, as amended shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nay: None:

S-1-67

Motion by Gaus, supported by Black, that the developer Mr. Vernell Meese be advised

that at the meeting of the Planning Board on Tuesday, March 7, 1967 the Preliminary Plat of Orchardvale was approved, subject to the following conditions:

Final plat should be developed with all public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and the Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

Construction and improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior to approval of the final plat.

All required easements should be recorded on the face of the final plat.

All lots should be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.

This approval shall expire March 7, 1968.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds stated that bids for demolition of 16 buildings in Lansing's downtown urban renewal project area were received by the City Council. These include seven buildings in the 100 block of N. Washington Avenue, five in the 300 block of N. Capitol Ave., a two story structure at 107 E. Michigan Ave., the Knights of Columbus building at 420 N. Capitol Ave. and a two-story structure at 116-122 W. Ionia Street.

Mr. Fink stated that he was concerned about the proposed development that would go in the land in the 200 blocks of N. Washington Avenue.

Further discussion followed.

It was suggested by Mr. Guernsey that the Planning Board meet with the Re-development Board.

ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. Brown presented the new zoning map, stating that the main purpose of the presentation was to get the Board's reaction.

Mr. Fink asked what type of density was being proposed around the one mile radius of the center of the city, and was told that R N 2 is up to 70 dwelling units per acre. Mr. Fink questioned the setback from the center core for the high density apartment developments, and Mr. Brown replied that it was 50 feet from the center line of the street.

Further discussion followed.

CAPITOL IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Fink complimented the Staff on the job they did putting out an outstanding Capitol Improvement Program this year. Moved by Fink, supported by Heino, to give full support to the Capitol Improvement Program.

PLANNING DIRECTOR

Mr. Guernsey stated that there would be a joint meeting with the Traffic Board on March 14, 1967 at 7:30 P.M.

Letter from the Michigan Welfare League concerning application for membership was read, and referred to the Executive Committee for discussion and report.

Mr. Fink asked if anyone was going to attend the American Society of Planning Officials meeting in Houston, and Mr. Guernsey replied that there were no funds available.

Meeting adjourned at 11:35 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

C/M

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, March 21, 1967

Meeting was called to order at 7:45 P.M. by Chairman Ramona Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present were: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Siebert, Manz and Reynolds—6.

Absent: Fink and Heino—2.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

SS-3-67

Change in the definition of "family" Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. James Church, Planner, discussed the proposed amendment to the Zoning Code, stating that the Planning Board at their meeting of February 21, 1967 requested Council to set March 21, 1967 as a hearing date of the following amendment to Chapter 36, Code of Ordinances of the City of Lansing:

Section 36-1. Definition-To amend (16) to read:

"Family" an individual or two or more persons related by blood, marriage or adoption together with not more than two (2) other persons, or a group of not more than three (3) persons who need not be related by blood, marriage or adoption, living together as a single housekeeping unit in a dwelling unit.

Mr. Church stated that this amendment would allow for better enforcement of the existing zoning codes as related to nuisance problems in several areas of the city.

Mr. Black stated that it was his understanding that it won't make any difference how big a family is as long as they are related by blood or marriage, but once they are not related, you limit the number of people who can live together as a family.

Mr. Church replied that this is correct, and that the only other way of doing it is to specify each separate relationship.

Further discussion followed in regard to the term "family".

Matter was referred to the Ordinance Committee.

STREETS COMMITTEE

S-18-66P

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the Schafer Preliminary Plat of Industrial Acres be approved subject to the following conditions:

Final Plat should be developed with all public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and Lansing Sub-division Regulations.

Construction and improvement drawing should be submitted and approved prior to approval of the final plat.

All required easements should be recorded on the face of the final plat.

All lots shall be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.

Street right-of-way should be 66 feet with 36 foot pavements.

The proposed street should be extended to the South property line. An additional stub street to the East should be provided to allow for future development of the vacant land East of the site.

This approval shall expire March 21, 1968.

Mr. Vernon Fountain, presented sketch and explained No. 6 in the above listed conditions.

Mr. Guernsey asked if the property owner is aware of the requirements, and whether or not the property owner was in favor or opposed to the conditions in the recommendation?

Mr. Fountain replied that no, the property owner had not been contacted and that he was not aware of the conditions for approval.

Mr. Black stated that the Zoning Streets Committee wasn't as interested in the fact that he had to extend the street, but that provision had to be made so that those extensions could be accomplished when the next piece of property is developed. I am wondering if condition No. 6 should not actually say that provision should be made for extension of the proposed street South of the property line.

Mr. Fountain replied that since this is preliminary approval, the conditions may be proper as they are written.

Mr. Guernsey raised the question that perhaps, in the future, the two lots to the South would have to bear the full cost of the development of the street being extended Southward and the stub street being extended to the East.

Further discussion followed concerning the cost of the proposed street and the future development of the Southern portion of the proposed subdivision.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Siebert, Manz, and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

ROW-2-67

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council, that an alley extending 296 feet South from the 800 block of Reo Road, adjacent to the East line of Lot 37 Sonnenberg Half-Acre Subdivision, be vacated, the City to retain a utility easement.

The alley has not been improved or used. The Council approved development plans for property to the Southwest (Vincent Court) showing the subject alley as not being needed as an outlet to Reo Road. The Michigan Bell Telephone Company has a pole line located in the alley and requests an easement.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Siebert, Manz, and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

ROW-3-67

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that after considering the request of (14) fourteen property owners to vacate an alley known as Mosher Street, located between Hill Street and the C & O right-of-way North of Prospect Street, that the Northerly 396 feet of Mosher Street be vacated subject to the retention of a utility easement by the City.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Siebert, Manz, and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

BP-1-67

Motion by Manz, seconded by Black, to recommend to the City Council that after considering the request of the Pentecost Development Company, to purchase or trade land for a 240 ft. x 200 ft. parcel fronting on Holmes Road, West of Burchfield Avenue in the vicinity of S. Washington Ave., that the Planning Board does not recommend that the City sell this property at this time, as it is presently being used by the City, could be changed to another use which would benefit by this location, or be needed for a street realignment in the future.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Siebert, Manz, and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

SS-1-67

Mr. William Bechtel, Planner, gave a presentation on the Master Plan residential density study of the Southeast area. Mr. Bechtel stated that the purposes of this study are to review the Master Plan proposals, as developed in 1960, for the area known as the Forest Road Community, in the Southeast part of the City. The conclusions of the study indicate that revisions in the Master Plan for this area should take place. These revisions were enumerated in the summary and are the result of changing policies in the Lansing region as well as the nation.

Mr. Guernsey explained in detail the background of the study.

Mr. Bechtel explained the uses proposed by the Master Plan of 1960 and then giving the preliminary uses proposed as a result of this special study.

Further discussion followed.

Recess.

ZONING COMMITTEE

SS-4-62

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the request to amend the Community Unit Plan of Blueberry Hill Townhouse development, located at 3900 Block Pleasant Grove Road be granted subject to:

The signs being located essentially as shown on the plan submitted, but not to overhang the public R.O.W.

The size of the signs are not to exceed that which is shown on the drawing submitted.

The location of the proposed signs will be located within the boundaries of the existing townhouse development, and will be located as not to extend into public R.O.W.

The Board believes the amendment would be in keeping with the general intent of the zoning code, and would not adversely affect any adjoining property or the general welfare.

The change is to permit the erection of two poles mounted identification signs, one at the Hillcrest St. entrance on the West side of the project the other on Wadsworth St. on the East side. The signs measure 2½ ft. x 4 ft. and will read as shown on the sketch.

Mr. Reynolds asked if this meant that the smaller sign at the bottom (as shown on the sketch) would be eliminated and was told that it would.

Motion carried by the following votes:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Siebert, Manz, and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-154-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the petition by Harold Davis to rezone the property at the 100 and 200 block of East Jolly Road, be tabled until April 4, 1967, due to the request of the developer.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-188-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the petition to rezone property at 1800 and 1900 block of Hoyt Street, from "A" one family to Community Unit Plan be tabled, until adequate funding is provided for the construction of the necessary drainage facilities.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-192-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the petition to rezone property at Hoyt and Aurelius Roads, from "A" one family to Community Unit Plan be tabled until adequate funding is provided for the con-

struction of the necessary drainage facilities.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-8-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the request for withdrawal of the petition by Arnold Kegebin, to rezone a parcel at the S.W. corner of Saginaw and Logan described as:

Lots 15 through 19 of Standard Real Estate Companys, Westmoreland Addition

from "B" one family to "E-2" drive-in district be accepted and that the property remain in its present classification.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Siebert, Manz, and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-33-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the property at the S.W. corner Shiawassee St. and Washington Avenue described as:

North 18 ft. of Lot No. 3, the East 7 ft. of Lots 11 and 12, the East 7 ft. of the North 18 ft. of Lot 10, and entire Lots 1 and 2. All property located in Block 83 original plat, City of Lansing, also the North 150 ft. of the public alley that divides said block 83. This property is further known as the North 150 ft. of Parcel 5C of Urban Renewal Project No. 1

from "G" business district to "E" apartment shop district be approved.

A tentative proposal for this site has been submitted by the Walter Neller Company for development, and would need modifications and/or changes to meet the zoning regulations. It is believed that the combination shopping and residential project proposed for the southwest corner of Washington and Shiawassee St. would be accepted use in the "E" apartment district, with the least variation of the zoning code.

The height, yard and lot area requirement are met in some respects. Where deviation from the ordinance is deemed necessary and advisable an application to the Board of Zoning Appeals petitioning for a variance as required could provide the necessary relief.

It would be necessary to work out parking arrangements within a reasonable distance of the site.

The Board of Appeals approval is reasonable if arrangements are made by lease or ownership to provide at least one parking space per apartment unit.

Mr. Fountain presented the sketch of the proposed rezoning, showing the proposed uses on the site.

Mr. Guernsey explained that the use would consist of a two story building with commercial below and housing space above.

Mr. Reynolds further elaborated on not only this site but also the proposed development within the project.

Further discussion followed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Siebert, Manz, and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that:

WHEREAS the proposed zoning map has now been completed to the point where policy discussions should take place.

And WHEREAS it is advisable that the Board discuss the text and map with the City Council,

The proposed zoning map be forwarded to City Council for the Council's review and consideration, and it is further recommended that the Council be requested to schedule at their convenience, a joint meeting with the Board to review the text and maps prior to the holding of public hearings.

Mr. Black suggested that the Board review the maps before the discussion with Council.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Siebert, Manz, and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Motion by Black, seconded by Siebert, that:

WHEREAS the dynamic progress in the redevelopment of the Central City involving the State of Michigan, urban renewal, Lansing Community College, and private

investment, requires firm planning policies to guide and coordinate orderly community development and

WHEREAS comprehensive community planning requires a routine and orderly process of master plan review and

WHEREAS there is demonstrated community support for the Central City development plan as preliminarily adopted by the Board in November, 1966,

Be it therefore resolved.

That the Master Plan of December 30, 1960 be amended to revise the generalized land use plan and, the various plans concerned with physical development in accordance with the functional land use plan as finalized in November of 1966 and developed by Villican-Lehman and Associates planning consultants; the Lansing Planning Board, with data and design assistance from Larry Smith and Company real estate consultants, and Johnson, Johnson and Roy Landscape Architects,

And be it further stated that this important Master Plan amendment has been developed with the full awareness that the Central City—the heart of our metropolitan area, is continually in the eyes of the State, as well as the nation, and that steps to the revitalization of the Central City require the cooperation of all.

The Planning Board therefore urges the Council to support its action in achieving this amendment in its continuing efforts to resolve additional needs. Only thus can we realize our goals and achieve the Central City's dynamic potential.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Siebert, Manz, and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Letter from Michigan Welfare League re: membership, referred to the Executive Committee.

Mr. Guernsey stated that there would be a meeting with the Redevelopment Board on March 23, 1967 at 7:30 P.M. in the Planning Department conference room.

Meeting adjourned at 10:12 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, April 18, 1967

Meeting called to order by Chairman Ramona Bretz at 7:35 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Absent: Manz—1.

Others Present: Frank Perrin, Second Ward Councilman; Allen Hayes, Traffic Department; George Wyllie, City Engineer; Meryl Wilcox, Deputy Assessor; Bernard Elliott, Building Commissioner; Charles Hayden, Park Director.

Mr. Guernsey welcomed the people and gave an outline of the meeting, explaining that as yet there is no major Master Plan change for the Forest Road Community. This meeting is the first step in the revision of the Master Plan. The proposed changes will be presented later and discussed.

Mrs. Bretz introduced Councilman Perrin. Mr. Perrin remarked that the Planning Board and Staff, and himself as Councilman, are very much concerned about the planning and the proper development of the area. It came about much faster than expected. There must be proper planning for the area in order to develop it into the type of community you want to live in and to protect your property. The first step taken, when an area is annexed into the City, is to install sanitary sewers. This area is having problems. Fortunately we have been able to survey the area, determine the drainage flow, build two pumping stations that were required to serve the area, and install the majority of needed laterals. Most of the area is or will be supplied with water. This amounted to approximately one half million dollars of city funds, and in addition to other City services. This meeting was called to hear the suggestions and questions from you as concerned property owners. Mr. Perrin apologized that he was unable to stay at the meeting because of budget hearings.

Mr. Guernsey outlined on the map the Forest View area and its relation to the

city limits. He explained that in 1960 Lansing adopted a Master Plan. This was the first major revision of the City's Master Plan. The original was adopted in 1938. In 1960 the Forest View area had not yet been annexed, therefore the Master Plan was not detailed in the development of the area. This is why we wish to analyze and reevaluate the future development of the Forest View Community. Mr. Guernsey then stated what the proposals for the Forest View Community in the 1960 Master Plan proposed a residential density of one acre lots.

William Bechtel presented the proposals for the area which have been brought to the city's attention in the last year or so.

Mr. Guernsey commented that some of the requests obviously will be favorably considered and some can not be. For example an industrial use right next door to an established single family development, in terms of good city planning is not proper. The meeting was opened to hear comments from the audience relative to the matter.

Helen Peterman, owner of the Green Meadows Subdivision, asked, "With all the proposals for multiple dwellings around residential dwellings, how will this affect the financial situation? Will this lower the trend of financing in the residential area?"

Mr. Guernsey replied preliminary analysis for the area has been done, but there is nothing concrete at this point. This is the purpose of the meeting, to hear the comments of concerned property owners.

Ray Jusick, 3212 Leawood Drive, asked if the Board of Education has a special permission for the storage of school buses, gas station, and maintenance garage, is this a special zoning?

Mr. Guernsey stated that this is an accessory use to a school facility. It is not a special rezoning.

Mr. Jusick stated that twice a day 46 buses go up and down a residential street. This does not seem reasonable.

Mrs. Bretz commented that the Chamber of Commerce Educational Committee dis-

cussed school buses at their meeting that morning in regards to their storage.

Mr. Jusick asked if there was any way to slow down the Highway Department from withdrawing more land for the I-496 installation since the borrow pits will probably have to be filled.

Mr. Guernsey answered that approximately two years ago, when the borrow pits were being dug, the city tried to prevent the Highway Department from digging the pits, and to my knowledge the pit that is directly South of the school site was condemned by the Federal Government and that case has just recently been settled. The city was not successful in preventing the removal of borrow from the pits and it is my understanding that the Highway Department does intend to deepen some of the pits but I have been told they do not expect to expand them. Our preliminary thinking has been that the pits would be filled and the land would be developed in a residential manner.

Wilfred Anderson, 3000 Forest Road, asked if anything would be done in the near future to get rid of water. Mr. Wyllie said that storm sewers were intended but since the bond issue failed, it cannot be done now. When the money is available it will be done.

Mr. Anderson then commented on the mosquito spraying and asked when the city will be spraying. Mr. Hayden answered that the ponds had already had a pre-treatment spray once around the city. They will need more and we are, on established routes, hitting all of the pond areas.

Loren Brown, 4018 Collins Road, asked what the city's plans were for the area between Collins Road and I-496? Is it possible more of this will be zoned commercial or for multiple dwellings? Mr. Guernsey answered that there is no detailed plan at this time. Since you are a property owner in that area, we would like to know what your wishes are regarding this matter. Michigan State University is acquiring more land in that area. Mr. Brown asked if Holmes Road would come to I-496 or would it continue on across Collins Road and possibly connect with the University?

Mr. Guernsey replied that there are only preliminary plans on this matter, but it may not be extended beyond Aurelius Road. Mr. Brown questioned if there was any idea as to when storm sewers could be installed in the area and if the projects approved by City Council will connect? Mr. Guernsey commented that there is a legal question involved in the bond issue and this is being pursued. As far as the extension of the sewer is concerned, the Council approved those uses subject to them paying the total cost of the extension of the sewer to serve them.

Mr. Wyllie commented that the sewer can be extended to serve the motel unit.

Don Cleves, 2417 E. Mt. Hope Avenue, asked Mr. Hayden what can be expected in the future in regard to the Red Cedar Park where the bond issue was voted down? Mr. Hayden answered that it depends on available money. The application has been forwarded to Washington for assistance. It could be possibly two years before we know whether it has been accepted. If at that time local funds are available to match Federal funds, undoubtedly the purchase will go forward. If not, the project may be dropped.

Mr. Cleves then stated that since the bond issued was defeated, his taxes had been raised, and asked if he filled in the back of his land, would his taxes again be raised? Mr. Hayden replied that he could not answer for the Assessor's, but as far as he knew the residents should go on and live as usual, as though no request for a park had been made.

Mrs. Patterson, 2243 Luwanna Drive, stated she was quite interested in what Mr. Granger is going to do with the pits? She complained about traffic on the street, smoke, dust and dirt from burning. If the pits are going to be filled will they continue to use our street, and are they going to be allowed to continue to burn?

Mr. Guernsey replied that if the pits are allowed to be filled, then the manner in which it is done would have to be in accordance with a long term plan for future development of the area. He stated that we will look into what can be done about shifting access to these pits to cause less disturbance in the community. Mrs. Patterson then asked what is to be done with the property between Luwanna and Cavanaugh Road, which is supposed to be residential. Mr. Guernsey stated that the complaints will be taken into consideration in regards to the filling.

Mr. Ingram, 2929 Manley Drive, asked why this area still had Consumers Power electricity since they had been in the city for some years. He also stated that he did not understand why he had been assessed \$13.00 overcost on his sanitary sewer since the sewer was put in under a contract. He also questioned the regulation for charging for dumping in the city dump. Mr. Wyllie stated that the sewer contracts are let by unit prices. When the job is done sometimes there is a few feet more. Also there are charges not in the contract and the city has to pay for inspectors, street repairs. The original is an estimated cost.

Jack Kline, Director of Engineering from the Board of Water and Light, stated that they would like to serve this area, however, they do have franchise agreements at this moment and cannot serve the area.

Mrs. Chavez, 5005 Eastlawn Drive, also complained about charges for dumping and also felt the area should be on Board of Water and Light service now.

Mrs. Chavez requested a dead end street sign and a street light on Eastlawn Drive. Mr. Hayes stated that they were glad to install the signs when they had requests for them. Mr. Ray Jusick, 3213 Leawood Drive, Board of Water and Light employee, stated this can be looked into and there is a way we can get a street light in here.

F. O. Grounds, 2909 E. Mt. Hope Avenue, spoke in regard to the flood plain area north of Mt. Hope Avenue. He asked, if the Planning Board and Zoning Committee of the Planning be free with their explanations, and allow us to have open use and ask for and received rezoning requests for this same land.

Mrs. Bretz commented that many rezonings have been turned down, and that the Board is not always told why rezonings are turned down.

Mrs. Grounds asked if the city is turning down zoning requests because of perhaps the city intends to use the area as park as proposed in the Master Plan. If this is true, then I think it is unfair.

Mr. Guernsey explained that the Master Plan does propose that this area be reserved for flood plain use and in the future for park. If those people who own large pieces of the flood plain asked for industrial rezoning or high density apartment uses or commercial uses this would be reviewed in terms of the Master Plan as is true with any normal land use development. If you wanted to build additional uses in accordance with the existing zoning you could get a building permit for the site.

Mr. Delaney, 3721 Aurelius Road, stated that last fall when the sewer was put in the county drain was broken; it was unplugged but the water is still on my property.

Mr. Wyllie, City Engineer, replied that the drain was broken by the Board of Water and Light, and he was under the impression that it had been corrected. He will look into the situation.

Mr. Loren Brown, 4018 Collins Road, stated that there is a rumor that Dunkel Road is proposed to be extended across Michigan State University property connect with Harrison Road as a second major exit off I-496 onto the campus.

Mr. Guernsey replied that to his knowledge there was no indication that this is true. Robert Trajanak, representative from Michigan State University, stated that there are no plans to extend Dunkel Road across the campus.

Gerry Butterwick, 630 Emily Street, stated that a year ago he bought a lot in Leawood Subdivision. At that time he was told by the realtor that water and sewer were going to be provided. After his December taxes came and the added assessment was not on them he called the Assess-

sor's Office and was told they would bill him and not to worry about it. He then contacted the builder and had a date set aside to start construction of the house. The builder applied for and received a building permit. Now the basement is up and the house is ready to be roughed. On Monday morning the builder called and said there was no sewage. A septic tank would have to be put in besides pay the city \$300 deposit for the sewer for which I have no use. After going to City Hall and talking to Mr. Wyllie that same day the builder called and said the Health Department would not accept the request for a septic tank. At the present the builder has written a letter to the Board of Education to see if I can hook on to the sewage that is running to the school with a pump on my house. As I listen to all these proposals for the future, why not have that sewer completed where people are paying taxes now? If my basement is left open to the weather for a year the blocks will be ruined. I don't know yet if I can hook on to the other sewer.

Mr. Fink stated that this is a good opportunity for people at the meeting under similar conditions who are wondering when you will get services for your residential property. I would suggest that the people here tonight form an organization and let your Councilman know what your problems are. The Planning Board only recommends but the Council ultimately makes the decision where the bonding programs are for the sewers and all the other services that you need as residents of the City of Lansing.

Rocky Basil, 2214 Robinson Road, asked, "That since his road bordered a proposed multiple dwelling development if that whole area would be rezoned from its present "A" one residential to multiple dwelling." Mr. Guernsey replied that the proposals outlined were requests that the city has received, they have not yet been approved or disapproved. Mr. Basil commented that the renter does not pay the brunt of the taxes, and that he is in objection to the proposed multiple development.

Mrs. Metzger, 2614 Wabash, asked, "If the apartment proposals are approved, what affect will they have on the property owners in the area in regard to the assessed value of their property?" Mr. Wilcox, Deputy Assessor, replied that it would depend on how the value of the property remained after construction of the apartments.

Mrs. Metzger then asked if the proposals are approved if the owners of them would keep them up to par, provide playground area for the children in the apartments, and what facilities do they plan for the apartment houses. Mr. Guernsey replied that it is the Planning Board's responsibility to review the requests very carefully. He cited examples of property appreciation and devaluation. Mrs. Metzger asked if the city thought that the best development of the area in question was apart-

ment dwellings rather than single family dwellings. Mr. Guernsey replied that apartments are more valuable than single family homes in an economic sense because they are valued and taxed higher. There are some very definite limitations in terms of the amount of sewage and other utilities capacities that we can service the area with. There will have to be an allocation of multiple family apartment districts.

Mr. DeNaus, 2279 Forest Road, requested a sidewalk for children to get to school safely. He commented that the apartments would bring a large amount of traffic.

Mrs. Bretz told him that the sidewalks can be petitioned for.

Ron Lott, 3133 Leewood Drive, spoke on the fact that those on Leewood Drive did not have sewers and of the complications in regard to obtaining them.

Mr. Wyllie replied that sewers can be petitioned for. Petitions have to be signed by over 50% of the owners of the benefited property. Mr. Wyllie stated that the city does not like to build sewers except on public streets, and it would be better if there was a street opened by a developer for the sewer so it would do the least damage to future development.

Mr. Kline, Board of Water and Light, stated that at the present time there is an existing 16 inch main on Aurelius Road. The present plans, as soon as definite information is available on developments, is to put in 8,000 feet of eight inch on Cavanaugh Road and Dunkel from Aurelius Road to Collins. As an alternate to that 10,500 ft. of 12 in. on Jolly Rd. and Collins from New York Central to Dunkel Road. The general policy is that if sewers are not available, we do not provide the water. This is a standing policy of the city.

Mr. Lott asked if when their taxes are assessed, are they assessed without improvements, no sewers, no water, one street light, dirt streets. Only our one block is without these improvements.

Mr. Wilcox stated that normally you are not assessed for improvements that you do not have. He suggested that Mr. Lott come to the office and discuss this problem.

Mrs. Haag, who lives north of Cavanaugh Road, stated that last summer a sewer was installed in her area but that the water line only comes to Cavanaugh Road.

Mr. Kline replied that if she had sewer chances were good that she would get water.

Mrs. Haag asked if the corner of Cavanaugh and Aurelius Road was zoned for industry? Mr. Bechtel replied that the northeast corner has about 5½ acres commercial and parking zoning. The northwest corner is residential and south of Cavanaugh is industrial on the west side of Aurelius.

Mrs. Rippy, 4620 Eastlawn Drive, asked what the Planning Board had in mind for 18 acres of vacant land between Dunkel and Aurelius Road. Mr. Bechtel replied that the zoning for the area is residential. Consumers Power has a right-of-way, and there are no plans for rezoning so far. Mr. Guernsey commented that the Master Plan does propose a park to be located somewhere in the area.

Mr. Cullen Dubose, 2718 Wabash, stated that he was in objection to any planning that would make the residential property on Manley Road and in Leewood Subdivision less desirable. He also asked why sanitary sewage hinges on the bond issue when the property owners are paying 80% of the cost of the sewers?

Mr. Wyllie replied that sanitary sewers were not involved in the bond issue. There were storm sewers involved.

Mr. Charles Green, stated that he owned six acres at the head of Manley Drive where the low pocket is, and has had a request from a church for purchase of the property. Asked for a show of hands as to the thoughts of the people in the area in regard to a church in the area.

Merlin Babcock, 1832 Hoyt Avenue, commented on the land across the street from him. Asked if anything could be done about it. He was referred to the City Building Inspector.

Recess from 9:10 to 9:40 P.M.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the minutes of March 21, 1967 be approved as printed.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

STREETS COMMITTEE

S-2-67P

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Heino, that the rules be suspended to permit Mr. Geisenhaver, the developer of the preliminary plat of Delaware Park, to address the Board.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Geisenhaver stated that he has an option on the property which he plans on fulfilling. There was one piece of property on which there is a question. In regard to the screening we plan on putting in we have no intention of blocking the man's property.

Mr. Main, Planner, read the letter from Donald Peckham to the Board, in which he claims a property easement of access on

Pearl Court located along the entire length of the east side of his property.

Mr. Gaus questioned if Mr. Geisenhaver had a release from the Peckhams to proceed. Mr. Geisenhaver replied that he did not.

Mr. Steadman, registered surveyor, stated that he has examined the language in the deed referred to by Mr. Peckham in his letter. It is Mr. Steadman's opinion that Mr. Peckham has an easement to the land which would have been Pearl Court. This is not a fee interest, only an easement. It is my understanding of the Plat law that one does not need approval of easement holders to record a plat. Mr. Peckham does have legal right to use this property. Mr. Gaisenhaver does not intend to deny him access to his property. We intend to remove the proposed buffer strip from in front of Mr. Peckham's land.

Further discussion followed on easement rights.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the preliminary plat of Delaware Park be approved subject to the following conditions:

Final plat should be developed with full public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and the Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

Construction and improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior of the final plat.

Street rights-of-way should be 66 feet with 36 foot pavement. A right-of-way dedication of 50 feet North of the South line of Section 4 for Miller Road should be included.

All required easements should appear on the face of the final plat. The Weigman drain easement should be shown and referenced with dimensions to the appropriate lot corners.

All lots should be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.

The grading along Outlot "A" should be completed so that the abutting property will not be damaged.

A temporary cul-de-sac should be constructed at the Northern limit of Annapolis Drive.

This approval shall expire April 18, 1968.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Moved by Fink that the motion be amended to indicate that the City Attorney would

pass on the status of the easement before the final plat is approved. Seconded by Gaus.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

SM-3-67

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the request to divide this parcel of land at the Southeast corner of Luwanna Drive and Aurelius Road into two lots be granted subject to the following conditions:

That the structure on the corner lot be oriented to Luwanna Drive and that sufficient front yard on Aurelius Road be maintained to allow for future widening of Aurelius Road.

That the lots be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.

The Board further recommended to the City Council that the additional 27 ft. for Aurelius Road be acquired.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Mr. Reynolds reported on a hearing on the state necessity law, which will if put into effect, speed up some of our acquisition problems in Urban Renewal. We have also interviewed two planning consultants for Urban Renewal No. 2.

ORDINANCE

Mr. Guernsey reported that the Council Committee of The Whole has discussed the zoning ordinance and map, and ask that we forward to them a sketch copy of the zoning map which the Staff is now preparing. We will forward that to them and at that time a date will be set to meet with them.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

An application for personal membership has been filed with the Michigan Welfare League.

The question of a delegate to the Fine Arts Committee is tabled. A volunteer is asked for from the Board. The Executive Committee will review.

Mr. Guernsey reported that on May 8, 9, and 10th is the Michigan Society of Planning Officials conference in Battle Creek. Conference registration and transportation can be paid.

Letter from the Lansing School District regarding the use of the school was read to the Board by Mr. Guernsey.

Referred to the Planning Board Zoning Committee to be reported on at next meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

100 block E. Saginaw Street referred to the Planning Board from City Council to be considered in light of the expansion of Community College.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, April 4, 1967

Meeting was called to order at 7:40 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds, Fink and Siebert—7.

Absent: Heino—1.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

S-2-67P

D. Gregory Main, planner, discussed the location, land use, and proposed use by the developer of the preliminary plat of Delaware Park.

Richard Thompson, 5914 Coulson Court, stated that he owned a lot off Coulson Court and asked if he could purchase the lot in back of him to the west. He asked the name and where to get in contact with the developer of the proposed subdivision. Mr. Main replied that the developer was Mr. Geisenhaver and if he would call the Planning Department office the address would be given to him.

A person representing Mr. Donald Peckham, would like to know if Mr. Geisenhaver owns complete title to the land where the street is going to extend from Miller Road. Mr. Main replied that all that is required for a preliminary plat is that he have an option on the land. The question was asked if the Planning Department was aware of the fact that Mr. Peckham has an abstract that shows he has right-of-way over the

land that Mr. Geisenhaver proposes to put the road on? Mr. Main replied that conversations with the surveyor revealed that there could be some conflict as to title of this land. However, at this stage we are concerned mainly with the streets, lot size, and the layout. In order to actually go through and plot this land Mr. Geisenhaver would have to have full title to the land.

Mr. Donald Peckham, 134 W. Miller Road, stated that he would like to protest this development at this time.

Mr. Reynolds asked whose responsibility it is to prove ownership of the land, and Mr. Main replied that at the time of final platting the developer would have to prove ownership.

Further discussion followed in regard to the ownership of the land.

Mr. Black questioned the adequacy of the drain in the area, and Mr. Main replied report from Public Service indicated that it would be filled to capacity by this subdivision and that in the future a larger pipe would have to be installed.

Mr. Peckham was referred to the Public Service Department for information about the sewers.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-26-67

Letter was read from Chris A. Baryames, dated April 4, 1967 asking that this petition

presentation, to rezone property at 600 S. Logan from "E-2" to "F" commercial district, be withheld until further notice.

The matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-27-67

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 4526 S. Logan Street from "A" one family to "E-2" drive-in.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-28-67

Mr. Kenneth Brown, 921 Reo Road, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 919, 921, 933, 935 Reo Road from "A" one family to "C-2" family district. Mr. Brown stated that he wants to put up a fence after the property is sold. It would be around his property fronting on Reo Road. Mrs. Bretz asked if his frontage was 213.7 and Mr. Brown answered it was approximately that. He then stated that two of the lots would be 71 x 120 approximately and the third would be 71.7 x 120 approximately. Mr. Gaus asked the depth of the property between Reo Road and the proposed street? Mr. Brown replied that it was about 295 ft.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-29-67

Mr. Donald Fox, attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 3200 Ellen Avenue from "A" one family to "D-1" professional. Mr. Fox stated that in looking over this matter it would appear that the interests of all parties concerned would be best served by a special use permit. I would like to ask permission to adjourn this matter for a long enough time to permit me to apply for a special use permit on the property rather than attempting to rezone it. Mr. Brown, Assistant Planning Director, asked under what section of the ordinance did Mr. Fox plan to get the special use permit and Mr. Fox replied that he did not know. Mr. Fox explained that the use that has been made of the property has been technically in violation, but outwardly there is no apparent distinction between this property and the other single family residence home. We have no desire to change the appearance or character of the neighborhood. We prefer not to have a rezoning unless it is necessary to keep from putting us out of business. If we can obtain a special use permit and continue the business, I think this is more desirable.

Mr. Gaus asked the use on the property and Mr. Fox replied that the property is

and has been for 14 years for the sale of band instruments. It was not realized that there was a violation of the ordinance until just recently.

Mr. Fox stated that, with the Board's permission he would like to withdraw the petition with the understanding that they will be attempting to explore the possibilities of a special use permit and if it cannot be done, we will be back.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-30-67

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 1305 Greenwood from "A" one family to "C-2" family district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-31-67

Mr. William Forgrave, 2000 W. Kalamazoo Street, appeared on behalf of the petition to rezone property at the east side of Richwood, south of Louisa from "A" residential and "G-2" wholesale to "D-M" multiple dwelling. Mr. Forgrave stated that this request corresponds with what the Board recommended about a year ago when this was platted.

The matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-32-67

Mr. Ivan Bartha, 1019 W. Ionia, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone an irregular shaped piece of land abutting north of 820 N. Sycamore Street from "C-2" family to "D-1" professional. Mr. Bartha stated that this parcel was purchased from the State Highway Department at a public auction. He presented a number of sketches illustrating proposed development for the site.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-34-67

Mr. Peter Sheldon, Attorney representing the petitioners, appeared on behalf of the petition to rezone property at 900 N. Capitol Avenue from "D-M" multiple dwelling to "D-1" professional office district. Mr. Sheldon distributed to the Planning Board a copy of the zoning petition, a petition from landowners in the area who had no objection to the proposed rezoning, two sketches showing the proposed layout on the site, a map showing the existing

zoning classification in the area, a report from the Lansing Traffic Department showing the 24 hour traffic volume count on various intersections, a parking lease agreement, and a brief in support of the petition for rezoning. He then addressed the Board relative to the above documents.

Mr. Reynolds questioned the parking space qualifications, as stated in the lease, and also the time agreement. Mr. Sheldon replied that the lease is contingent upon the rezoning, and petitioners would try to solidify the lease and obtain longer terms to have something to negotiate from in the future.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-35-67

Barney Leahy, Real Estate Agent with the New York Central Railroad, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property in the 2800 block of S. Logan Street, from "A" one family to "G-2" wholesale district. Mr. Leahy stated that they had tried to obtain purchasers of the subject property for a residential development, but were turned down primarily because the location is next to heavy industrial. The proposed use, which is warehousing, would act as a buffer zone between the drop forge industrial and the residential district.

To discuss plans of the purchaser of the property Mr. Leahy introduced the President of the Lansing Wholesale Grocers, Mr. Robert Baker. Mr. Baker stated his company is the only major food warehouse in the City of Lansing, formerly known as Redman Brothers. We are being forced to vacate our present location because it is in the path of I-496.

We have found a corporation that is willing to buy this particular plot of land if it is rezoned for warehouse development, and build us facilities for cash and carry and produce facilities. Any facilities we put in will enhance the area. Have exhausted about every possibility for warehousing facilities in the City and this property is our last hope before going outside of the City.

Mr. Reynolds asked about the access to the property, and Mr. Baker replied that the State will allow them egress and ingress on Logan Street and at the time Logan changes to a proposed divided highway then our access would be Holmes and if the City permitted, Victor Street going on to Logan.

Mr. Gaus asked the size of the proposed building? Mr. Baker replied that the first stage for cash and carry terminal and produce would be approximately 20 to 25 thousand square feet. The second stage would be approximately 100 thousand sq. feet.

Mr. Fred Pierce representing the Lansing Metropolitan Development authority stated

that he would like to go on record as being in support of this rezoning petition.

Further discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-37-67

John R. Stump, attorney, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 3019 W. Miller Road from "A" one family and "F" commercial to "H" light industry district. Mr. Stump referred to his letter of March 30, 1967 in which he asked that this petition presentation be adjourned to May 2, 1967.

Motion by Fink, supported by Black, that this petition be tabled for public hearing to May 2, 1967.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-36-67

Charles Updike, 3526 W. Saginaw Street, architect, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at S. Logan Street and Holmes Road from "J" parking to "F" commercial district. Mr. Updike stated that he was representing the petitioner, W. W. Partnership, who wish to purchase this piece of property, the size being 120 x 120, for the purpose of a drive-in take out restaurant. They will furnish their own on-site parking. Mr. Reynolds questioned the curb cut, and Mr. Updike replied that it is recommended by City Engineer there be a 30 ft. curb cut on the south side. The building will be 40 x 40 one story no basement.

Further discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-38-67

Julian F. Burt appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 2100 Turner Street from "D-M" multiple to "A" one residential district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Recess.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-22-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Black, that the Board recommend to City Council

that the petition by La Vern D. Peterman, to rezone a parcel in the 2000-2100-2200 Blocks Hamelon Street, described as:

Lots 1 through 24, Green Meadows Subdivision, City of Lansing from "A" one residential to "D-M" multiple district be denied.

The density allowed in the "D-M" zone would be completely out of character with the existing development both on the site and adjacent to it.

Rezoning could foster conversion of the existing homes which were designed for single family use.

Three of the lots are substandard in size by city standards.

Sanitary sewer was recently installed and was sized for single family density.

Storm sewer is not available in this area.

There are no substantial reasons why these cannot be developed in accord with the existing regulations.

Mr. Fink pointed out there have been two or three community unit plans whereby the density would be something about one third for the "D-M" that would take place in this area. One of the factors that resulted in the Planning Board's recommendation is that storm sewers are not in the area. This is not the only reason but a very crucial and serious one. The availability of storm sewers was contingent to a great deal on the bond issue. Also the amount of parking required in this type of development would mean an area of black-topping providing a greater runoff of water with no facility to take care of it.

Motion carried by the following vote.

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-12-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Gary Stowe, to rezone a parcel at 3811 Donald Street, from "A" one family to "C" two family district be denied.

The proposed change would be contrary to the established land use pattern which is single family residential.

The size of the parcel under consideration lacks approximately 1,000 square feet of meeting the recommended minimum of 6,500 square feet of land area for two-family development.

A change of zoning could foster uncontrolled land use development throughout

the established single family residential area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-13-67 and Z-14-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the petitions by Elton E. Tubbs at 2009 W. Holmes Road and Maurice E. Albertson of 2018 W. Holmes Road be tabled for 30 days, and the petitioners be encouraged to incorporate the land to the south, and submit a Community Unit Plan development.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-154-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that the Community Unit Plan by Harold M. Davis, in the 100 and 200 block E. Jolly Road, described as:

N. 15 A of S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 4, also N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ exc. parcel in N.W. cor 132 ft. E. and W. by 330 ft. N. and S. and parcel in N.E. cor. 132 ft. E. and W. by 330 ft. N. and S.; Sec. 4, T3N, R2W

N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 4 exc. com. N. $\frac{1}{4}$ post Sec. 4, thence S. 233 ft., E. 150 ft., N. 233 ft., W. to beg., also exc. com. S.W. corner Jolly Rd. and U.S. Hwy. 127, thence S. 1006.25 ft., W. 508 ft., N. 1008± ft., E. 510 ft. to beg., Sec. 4, T3N, R2W

W. 764 ft. of N. 15 A. of S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 4, T3N, R2W

The above described property includes land owned by the Board of Education, and is part of the Community Unit Plan Development, be approved subject to the following conditions:

That a landscape plan be submitted and approved by the Planning Board prior to the issuance of building permits.

Final approval of the platting of the property.

That the recommendations from the Fire Department, Board of Water and Light, Parks Department, Public Service, Board of Education, and Traffic Department be complied with.

That each parking space be a minimum of 9 feet by 20 feet and arranged as shown on the plan.

That 27 feet from the property line be dedicated for street R.O.W. for Jolly Road, as shown on the site plan.

The buildings and general arrangement be essentially as shown on the site map.

That the density in the conventional area be not more than 12 units per acre with 2 parking spaces per unit.

That a site plan for the conventional area, showing building locations, parking and driveways, be submitted and approved by the Planning Board and City Council prior to the issuance of building permits.

That all utility lines or cables be placed underground.

That final approval is valid for one year from the date of approval by City Council.

Reasons for approval:

That property adjacent to the area will not be adversely affected.

Because of the comprehensiveness and the land use relationships the proposed development will have a minimum affect on abutting properties.

That the plan is consistent with the intent and purpose of promoting the public health, safety, morals and general welfare.

The Public Housing section will be built to federal and city approved specifications, and upon completion to be managed by the Lansing City Housing Commission.

The conventional area will have to follow the approved plan and conform to the City of Lansing's Building Codes.

That the buildings shall be used only for multiple dwellings, and the usual accessory uses such as parking, storage, space, management office building, etc.

The plan as approved indicates the uses proposed for this development, these are in keeping with Section 36-7 of the Zoning Code.

Mr. Fink stated that some of us were concerned about the projection of the street through to Cedar Street to alleviate the high density traffic movement onto Jolly Road and as a fire exit. What is the status of this roadway into Cedar Street if any?

Mr. Brown replied that the Traffic Department has recommended that the north-south street be extended further south. No firm agreement presently exists with the owners.

Mr. Fink stated that he thought the Board should be aware of the high density in this area and of the serious difficulty if there should be a fire disaster. I would seriously recommend to the Staff that some other entrance be made available.

Mr. Gaus questioned the number of multiple dwelling units that are going to be allowed in this area.

Further discussion followed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: Gaus—1.

Z-199-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Manz, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by John L. Cote, Attorney, and Robert O. Ridenour, Trustee for Jehovah's Witnesses, to rezone a parcel at 3615 W. Jolly Road, from "A" one family to "B" district, be denied as filed and that the

Northerly 60 feet and the Southerly 325 feet of the property

be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking, and that the

South 110 feet of the North 170 feet of the property

be rezoned from "A" one family to "B" one family, with screening along the boundaries of the parking area to be provided at such time as the adjacent properties develop.

The site is located on a major street and close to a commercial center.

The major streets provide proper access to the site, and discourages the use of existing and potential residential streets.

The nearby commercial parking area could provide for over flow of off-street parking of the church.

Mr. Fink related that Mr. Cote, the attorney representing the petitioners, had called him and said they had made a serious attempt to acquire some of the additional land on either side of the property in question, but there are some unrecorded areas within the abstract and deeds that would make it very difficult to obtain a clear title. Mr. Cote stated that from a legal standpoint it would be almost impossible to acquire the additional property on either side without a great deal of research and that time is very critical at this point.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert.

Nays: None.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Fink, that the minutes of February 21, 1967 and March 7, 1967 be approved as printed.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-15-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Reynolds, that the Board recommend to City Council that the property at the 3500 block N. East Street, described as:

Lots 1, 2, and 3 of Woodlawn Sub-division

from "A" one family residence to "F" commercial and "J" parking district be rezoned as follows:

Lot No. 3 and the East 20 ft. of Lots 1 and 2

be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking, and

The balance of the property

be rezoned from "A" one family to "F" commercial district. Screening to be provided along the east lines, of Lot 1, 2, and 3 except for a 20 ft. set-back on Sheridan Road.

The site is located within the strip commercial development along this area of North East Street. The present "A" one family zoning prohibits any major improvements or alterations to the property, and also limits enforcement of adequate off-street parking, screening of adjacent residential properties, and general up keep of the premises.

This residential area of the City is not serviced by an intergrated shoppig complex, and depends on the existing strip commercial development for this type of service.

The Board believes that proper zoning of the site should be considered, which will provide for the necessary improvements on the property.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-16-67

Motion by Siebert seconded by Reynolds, that the Board recommend to City Council that the property at 4301 S. Pennsylvania Avenue, described as:

Lots 1 and 2 and N. 12 ft. of Lot 3, Pleasant Ridge Subdivision

from "F" commercial to "E-2" drive-in district be rezoned.

The present zoning of the site allows a multitude of uses some of which

could be severely detracting to the neighborhood. The "E-2" classification was designed and adopted as a service station zone. Past policy of the Board concerning service stations in this area has been to restrict them to an "E-2" classification. The Board believes that the existing land use pattern has been relatively stable and that this site should be rezoned to "E-2" to insure this stability.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-17-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the petition initiated by the Planning Board to rezone property at 5334 S. Cedar Street from "D" apartment and "J" parking to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be granted.

Mr. Fink asked if the Staff would have any recommendation as to how we might rezone 50 or 60 feet on the north end of what now is "D" to "J" parking, with the idea in mind that this could be developed as right-of-way.

Mr. Fountain replied it was proposed to come out on the north and now it is suggested to come out to the center line of the road. It all depends on where we want to reserve the right-of-way.

Further discussion followed on the development along this area of Cedar Street.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus, that the petition be tabled 30 days.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-18-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Robert C. June, M.D. to rezone a parcel at 423 W. Ionia Street, from "D-M" multiple to "D-1" professional district be granted.

The site is within an area designated as a professional office district on the Central City Plan.

Development of offices within this area will discourage further scattering of office uses in the Central City.

The zoning ordinance makes provision for off-street parking within this district.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-19-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Reynolds, that the petition by Bernard LaDuke to rezone property located 6070 S. Logan Street from "A" one residential to "F" commercial district be tabled for not more than 60 days in order that further study be made on this petition.

Mr. Fink stated that the intent is to give a more comprehensive analysis of the total area involved.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-20-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Francis N. Fine, Fine-Bilt Homes, Inc. to rezone a parcel in the 732-738 North Pennsylvania Avenue, described as:

Lots 25 and 26, Assessors Plat No. 22, City of Lansing

from "C" two family to "D-1" professional offices district, be denied.

The residential density allowed in the "D-1" professional district exceeds the density proposed in the Master Plan.

The proposed use would be contrary to the existing and future land use plan.

The sewers serving this area were designed for low density residential use. It should be pointed out that the existing sewers are presently overloaded and higher density would compound the situation.

"C-2" family zoning allows reasonable use of the land.

This request if granted would also allow office uses which when scattered throughout the city, creates incompatible land use relationships; stimulating requests for marginal development, declining values in adjacent residential properties and weakens the market potential of logical and desirable office areas.

The Planning Board considered a petition to rezone part of this land to "D-M" multiple dwelling in March of 1965. This Board at that time recommended denial and the City Council concurred.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds, and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-21-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the Board recommend to City Council that

the petition by Howard Alexander, to rezone a parcel at 3323 N. East Street, from "A" one family residential to "F" commercial and "J" parking district, be granted with the following conditions:

South 30 feet of the West 30 feet of Lot 52

be rezoned from "A" one family to "F" commercial, and that

The balance of the Lot

be rezoned "J" parking, with screening along the North line of Lots 52 and 53, and along the West line of Lot 52, Screening to consist of one of the following:

A 5 ft. high dense privet hedge.

A 5 ft. high chain link fence with dense evergreen planting having a mature height of 5 ft. to 5 ft. 6 in.

A 5 ft. high chain link fence with interwoven slats.

Or any other type of screening that may be suggested by the developer and approved by the Planning Department.

The change would provide additional off-street parking for the existing commercial development.

The change will remove a home which from field observation appears to be sub-standard.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-23-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Frank L. and Miriam R. Cook, to rezone a parcel at 3804 S. Pennsylvania Avenue, from "A" one residential to "F" commercial district be denied.

This area is designated as residential on the Master Land Use Plan.

This change would create an isolated district unrelated to similar districts i.e., This would be a spot zone.

Commercial uses adjacent to residential uses is detrimental to both.

The change could very well deter the improvement or development of the other properties in the immediate area in accord with the existing zoning.

This change would constitute a grant of a special privilege to an individual as contracted to the general welfare.

There are no substantial reason why the property cannot be used in accord with the existing zoning.

This request if approved would legalize erection of many kinds of commercial structures on an infinite number of commercial uses including used car sales.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-24-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Donald Hines, Attorney, for General Motors Corporation, to rezone property in the S.W. corner Logan and Olds Avenue be denied as filed.

The Planning Board further recommends that the following described property:

Blocks 1, 2, 3, 4, and Blocks A and B of Albert E. Cowles Subdivision

Also that portion of vacated Cowles St. lying South of Olds Ave., and North of the South line of Block "A" extended to the South line of Block "B", and that portion of vacated Albert St. lying between Logan St. and Birch St.,

Except that portion of the property lying West of a line described as:

Commencing 20 ft. E. of the N.W. corner of Lot No. 4, Block 2, A. E. Cowles Subdivision, thence southeasterly to a point on the South line of Lot No. 5, Block No. 2, A. E. Cowles Subdivision, which is 35 ft. East of the S.W. corner of Lot No. 5, thence continuing South 22° East to the point of ending on the Southerly line of Block "A" of A. E. Cowles Subdivision

be rezoned from "B" one family, "J" parking, "F" commercial and "H" light industrial to "I" heavy industrial district.

This includes a portion of the property on the Southeast corner of Olds Avenue, and Birch Street not owned by the General Motor Corporation.

Any change of zoning should be on a comprehensive zoning and proposed development plan.

A special survey was made to find the locations best suited to accommodate the future industrial demands of the community. The following characteristics were considered in analyzing potential sites:

(a) Transportation—accessibility by rail, highway and air facilities;

- (b) Topography—levelness, freedom from flooding and adverse soil conditions;
- (c) Utilities and Services — ease and economy of serving with utilities and services;
- (d) Effect on Surrounded Property — absence of nuisance aspect or prospect of otherwise damaging adjacent property;
- (e) Location in Overall Plan—suitability respect to relative need for land for other uses;
- (f) Accessibility to Workers—appropriately located as to be readily accessible to workers from residential areas;
- (g) Size of Site—large enough to provide sufficient acreage for modern facilities and space for future expansion.

This area falls within the proposed industrial complex indicated on the Master Land Use Plan.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

S-2-65P

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that Ted Prawdzik the developer, be notified that the Preliminary Plat of Prawdzik Subdivision was approved subject to the following conditions:

Final Plat to be developed with public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

Construction and improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior to approval of the final plat.

All required easements should be recorded on the face of the final plat.

All lots should be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.

Street right-of-way should be 66 feet with 36 foot pavement. A right-of-way dedication of 60 feet South of and adjacent to the North line of Section 30 for Mt. Hope Avenue should be provided.

Lewton Street should be extended West from its present limit to the East property line.

Deerfield Street should be extended North from its present alignment.

The strips of land along the West boundary of the site should be included as out-lots and replatted in conjunction with the land West of the site.

This approval shall expire April 4, 1968.

The City should negotiate with the developer for acquisition or dedication of those lots North of Lewton Street for park purposes. The existing park is substandard by current standards and would be severely limited when the rest of the area develops.

Mr. Main read a letter from Mrs. Krueger dated March 22, 1967.

Mr. Main stated that as far as sewers and water are concerned access would be provided.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

S-20-66F

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the Board recommend to City Council that the Final Plat of Park Terrace be approved by City Council subject to the following conditions:

All public improvements shall be installed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewers, storm sewers and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks and such other improvements as required under Section VI D of Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

The posting of financial security in the amount of:

Sidewalk	\$1,250.00
Monuments	80.00
Total	\$1,330.00

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Act of 1929 as amended shall apply.

Mr. Fink asked for clarification of Plat Act, upon inspection of the subject area when it was raining hard, the properties that abut this on the North side, the lots were literally flooded with water.

Mr. Black stated that if the natural drainage of water goes on another persons property there is nothing you can do about this, you can't interfere with natural drainage. You can prohibit someone from creating an artificial drainage situation where water goes on property when it ordinarily wouldn't have.

Mr. Main stated that as part of the conditions on approval of final plats is

that lots be graded so that water will drain therefrom.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds reported that Mr. Richard Zimmerman is the Acting Director of Urban Renewal. At this time we are in the process of interviewing consultants for preliminary planning for Project No. 2. When preliminary plans are near completion and ready for showing to the Redevelopment Board I will notify the Planning Board so that they may attend.

Discussion followed on low income housing.

ORDINANCE

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the Board recommend to City Council that the following amendment to the Zoning Code be adopted. To amend Section 36-1 (16) to read:

“Family” an individual or two or more persons related by blood, marriage or adoption together with not more than two (2) other persons as roomers, or a group of not more than three (3) persons, who need not be related by blood, marriage or adoption, living together as a single housekeeping unit in a dwelling unit.

The Planning Board at their meeting of March 21, 1967 held a public hearing on this amendment. The hearing did not produce any public testimony regarding the proposed zoning amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that hearing be set May 2, 1967 on the following proposed amendment to the Zoning Code: Section 36-42 (10) Small Animal Hospital; provided, however, such buildings occupy not over twenty five percent of the total area of the lot and will not have any serious depreciating effect upon the value of the surrounding property; out side runs will be prohibited and provided further, the building shall be set back from all yard lines a distance of not less than two feet for each foot of building height, but at no time shall the yard requirements be less

than what is required in the zoning district in which the property is located. (SS-13-65) (Small Animal Hospitals)

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Guernsey stated that City Council had received the Planning Board's letter recommending the Zoning Map, and it was referred to the Council Committee of The Whole. This committee will set a time and place to discuss the map and text with the Planning Board.

FINANCE

Mr. Guernsey stated that we are billing the Housing Commission for Staff services on housing sites during the last nine months.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Brown, Assistant Planning Director, read the letter from Homer Winegardner, Thayer Winegardner, and H. Burdette Bottom dated April 4, 1967 asking that their rezoning petition (Z-188-66) be removed from the table and acted upon.

Z-188-66

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the petition to rezone the property at 1800 and 1900 block Hoyt Street, from "A" one family to Community Unit Plan be removed from the table.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the petition be denied as filed because of lack of storm sewers, but that the Staff's conditions for approval be included in the recommendation to Council. Conditions are as follows:

That the proposed public street dividing the project be constructed to city standards, with the developers being required to post financial security for their share of the improvements.

That the East 17 feet of the property be dedicated for street R.O.W. for Aurelius Road, as shown on the site plan and in conformance with the major street plan.

That ingress and egress from Aurelius Road into Lot No. 61 be redesigned to give ingress and egress into the proposed public street.

That each parking space be a minimum of 9 feet by 20 feet.

That the landscape and screening plan be submitted and approved by the Planning

Board prior to the issuance of building permits.

That the recommendations from the Fire Department, Public Service, Traffic Engineer, Board of Water and Light be complied with.

That a temporary turn around be provided at the end of the proposed street.

The plan is valid for a period of one year from the date of City Council approval.

That the site plan be revised by the developer requiring ingress and egress to Lot No. 61, prior to forwarding a recommendation to City Council.

Application must be submitted for renewal if construction is not begun prior to the date of expiration.

Motion failed for lack of votes:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Manz and Reynolds—5.

Nay: Fink and Siebert—2.

Motion by Fink that this petition be sent to Council with approval, but pointing out that storm sewers are not available and if this is given final approval at the Council level that we will be establishing a precedent that will involve many other zoning petitions, and in view of the fact that the City cannot provide storm sewers at this time, it would place the City in an untenable position.

Seconded by Siebert.

Motion failed for lack of votes:

Yea: Fink and Siebert—2.

Nay: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Manz, and Reynolds—5.

Mr. Brown read two letters to the Board: 1) The letter from Michigan State University, Cap and Gown Series concerning a statewide program called Young Audiences, Inc., for Michigan elementary school students; and 2) A letter from the Michigan Municipal League concerning delegates for the annual meeting of the members of the Michigan Municipal League to be held in the Grand Hotel, Mackinac Island, September 7 to 9, 1967.

Mr. Guernsey stated the Planning Board will hold a public hearing at the Forest Road School on the proposed amendment to the Master Plan. The purpose will be to discuss with the Forestview citizens what is developing in the area.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Reynolds, that mid-month meeting of the Planning Board be held at the Forest View School on April 18, 1967 at 7:30 P.M.

Mr. Guernsey reported that he had a request from the Federal Civil Defense Agency, and by the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission to cooperate in the preparation for a shelter plan for the Lansing area. Request includes providing Staff, secretarial, part-time help, for which we will be completely reimbursed. The study would take from 12 to 18 months to complete. We would receive funds to hire additional Staff.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Reynolds, Mr. Guernsey be given the authority to

explore and when he reports back to the Board it be in the form of a recommendation that could be forwarded to Council.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

T/C

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, May 16, 1967

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Ramona Bretz at 7:39 P.M.

Present: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Absent: Black—1.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

S-3-67P Penn Industrial Park,
Preliminary Plat

Mr. D. Gregory Main, Planner, presented the proposed use, present zoning and location of the proposed subdivision plat.

Mr. Lily, Chairman of the Board of the Lansing Christian School Association, was present.

Mrs. Evelyn Grant, 5433 S. Pennsylvania, appeared in opposition to the proposed subdivision. She stated she had been told there would be a buffer strip between her home and the development. Mrs. Grant also had a copy of her deed restriction, which was shown to the Board.

Mr. Gaus asked if Lansing Christian School Association was going to stay in this location?

Mr. Lilly replied that their present intention is to remain in the area. We are planning on building a gymnasium right behind the school. If we are successful in selling some of the land, we are going to try to open another school at the northern end of the property, or on the west side.

Mr. Guernsey asked if they plan to develop an industrial area around an elementary school system. Mr. Lily replied that their intention is to put a fence around the school site. No children walk to the site, they are bused.

Mr. Siebert asked how long this property had been zoned industrial, and Mr. Main replied two or three years.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

S-4-67P Marscot Meadows No. 2,

Preliminary Plat

D. Gregory Main, discussed the location, present zoning, land use in the area, and the proposed development.

The developer was not present.

No one appeared in opposition to the proposed development.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

S-12-65P Delta River Drive Estates No. 2,
Preliminary Plat

D. Gregory Main discussed the location, land use in the area, and the proposed development.

Leon Schneeberger, developer, was present.

No one appeared in opposition to the proposed development.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

Z-35-67

Mr. Robert Baker appeared in regard to the petition, to rezone property in the 2800 block of S. Logan Street, from "A" one family to "G-2" wholesale district.

Mr. Baker, Lansing Wholesale Grocery Company, presented plans of the 33 acres encompassing the railroad right-of-way. They propose to start out with grocery warehousing. He gave a detailed explanation of the proposed development and the area in question. Lansing Wholesale is not buying this property, but if this is rezoned, will enter into an agreement to lease with a group that has formed a corporation to purchase the property.

The Corporation must buy the railroad site as well as the property which will total 33 acres.

Mr. Siebert asked how many carloads would be coming in on the track, and Mr. Baker replied about 15 a month. Mr. Baker commented that they have no definite answer from the State in regard to an entry off Logan Street, but they have been told not to plan on it. At this time we do have right-of-way on Victor, but doubt if the City will let us come out on Victor. We have including the railroad, an additional 30 ft. right-of-way on Logan Street so we have 66 ft. plus 30 ft. on Logan Street, 30 ft. on Victor.

Mr. Reynolds asked if they had explored the possibility of coming through the Lindell parking lot as access to the proposed warehouse? Mr. Baker replied that he doubted if Mr. Lindell would allow this.

Mr. William P. Ferguson, resident of S. Holly Way, stated that a group of residents of the area met with Mr. Robert Boatman, member of the American Institute of Planning, who had some information in regard to this proposal. We have put together a letter with some recommendations, suggestions, ideas, and objections. This letter was read to the Board by Mr. Ferguson. Received and placed on file.

Mr. Baker stated that they do not need an outlet on Holly Way.

Mr. Sam Taranova, representing the Warehouse Development Corporation, stated that the purchase of the land depends on the rezoning. As far as just rezoning the triangle part, I don't think the Corporation would purchase the land just for this triangle which only represents about 19 of the 38 acres.

Jim Covello, also representing the Warehouse Development Corporation, stated it was their understanding that the roadway was recommended by the Planning Staff. We do not need this roadway.

Mr. Guernsey commented that earlier in the discussion of this zoning, New York Central originally came to the City of Lansing through the area industrial corporation, and at that time the New York Central was willing to dedicate the arm of the land which lies to the southwest of the triangle for park purposes as a buffer, in agreement with working out a zoning relationship for the wholesale development which is to the northeast of the site. Apparently this has now changed.

Mr. Baker stated that the New York Central is requiring the Corporation to buy the entire property that they own as opposed to the earlier concept of buying only a portion.

Mr. Guernsey pointed out that there is a problem with storm and sanitary sewers on this site. This would be a part of the site development factors.

Mr. Baker replied that they were aware of this problem.

Mr. Anthony P. Nosal spoke in regard to the proposed rezoning.

Approximately ten persons were present in regard to this proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Recess from 8:40 to 9:19 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Richard Zimmerman, Acting Redevelopment Director, gave an informal up-to-date discussion on what is happening in Urban Renewal. He took each block in Project No. 2 and pointed out the proposed development, the progress of the land acquisition in each block, and the future demolition plans.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-35-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the petition to rezone property in the 2800 block of S. Logan Street, be tabled until June 6, 1967 for further study.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-45-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Elsa F. Abent to rezone a parcel at 317 Lincoln Street, from "B-1" family to "E" apartment-shop district be granted.

The use proposed is of a passive nature, and would not infringe on the residential area.

The site is close to Cedar Street and would not be contrary to the existing land use pattern.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Heino, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

S-4-67 F Marscot Meadows No. 2, Final Plat

Mr. Main, explained that the Final Plat of Marscot Meadows No. 2 was referred to the Planning Board by Council. It has never received preliminary approval or

gone through the preliminary processing. The hearing tonight was to begin the preliminary process and it is required by State law that the Planning Board act on the final plat within 30 days.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that the final plat of Marscot Meadows No. 2 be denied at this time without prejudice.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Heino, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

SS-4-67

Flood Plain Controls in all Zoning Districts. Hearing set for June 20, 1967.

SS-13-65

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, to amend the Zoning Code regarding small animal hospitals as follows, and would so recommend to City Council:

Sec. 36-42 Nonconforming uses

(10) Small animal hospital; provided however, such buildings occupy not over twenty-five percent of the total area of the lot and will not have any serious depreciating effect upon the value of the surrounding property; outside runs will be prohibited and provided further, the building shall be set back from all yard lines a distance of not less than two feet for each foot of building height, but at no time shall the yard requirements be less than what is required in the Zoning District in which the property is located.

Under definitions the following would be added:

Small animal hospital: A place where household pets are given medical or surgical treatment. Use as a kennel shall be limited to short time boarding and shall only be incidental to such hospital use.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Heino, Gaus, Manz, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. Guernsey reported on the candidate for the Planner IX position, stating his qualifications and background.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Guernsey announced the meeting with City Council on May 18, 1967 to discuss the Central City Plan.

Mr. Fink asked to be brought up to date on the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Guernsey replied that it is before Council for review on the preliminary text and map, and Council will set a meeting to discuss this matter in particular.

Mr. Guernsey then commented on Council's consideration for an increase in the zoning filing fee, and a time limitation before a petition for zoning could be resubmitted.

Discussion followed in regard to a filing fee which varies as to the proposed land use of the rezoning being considered.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus, recommending that the Board should suggest to the Planning Staff, that they should re-evaluate the rezoning fee that was proposed to Council 18 months ago.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Guernsey read to the Board the letter from Fred Hanses, Michigan Employment Security Commission, in regard to the CAMPS Committee.

Received and placed on file.

Meeting adjourned at 10:19 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, May 2, 1967

Meeting called to order at 7:43 P.M. by Chairman Ramona J. Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Absent: Manz—1.

PETITIONER'S PRESENTATION

Z-31-67

Mr. Don Morton appeared in regard to the petition to rezone a parcel at the east side of Richmond Street south of Louisa, from "A" one and "G-2" to "D-M" multiple dwelling.

Mr. Morton commented that he had a building all designed and ready to go on the property and that he wants to keep his property in its present zoning.

Mr. Gaus asked what type of building Mr. Morton intended to put on the property, he replied it would be an office building, not a warehouse.

Mr. Guernsey asked what he intended to build on the adjacent property, and Mr. Morton replied it would be used for parking.

Mr. Kierstad, representing Miracle Mile Inc., 2720 Pleasant Grove Road, stated that they owned the property to the south and east of the subject property. There exists a strip of "A" residential which rendered the property unusable. We have no objection to the "G-2" wholesale on this property.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-37-67

Mr. John Stump, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 3019 W. Miller Road, from "A" one family and "F" commercial to "H" light industry.

Mr. Stump distributed to the Board members a memorandum giving the background of the Barnhart Construction Company. He then explained the type of proposed building, the costs and dimensions, and the purpose of the proposed building which is to serve as a storage building for various inventory supplies and equipment. He also presented an exhibit showing the subject property and the surrounding land.

Mr. Black asked how much of the property is presently zoned "F" commercial, and Mr. Stump replied that 50 feet square is "F" commercial.

Mr. Fink asked why this property was zoned this way years ago? Mr. Guernsey replied that at that time the Master Plan showed this area to be residential. There was the opinion that this area was not suited for industrial at this time. We have had many requests for residential development. The whole area is not equipped with storm and sanitary sewers. Sewers will be extended for the recently approved housing project.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-39-67

No one appeared in regards to the petition to rezone the property at the S.E. corner of W. Miller Road and Grovenberg Road, from "A" one family to "D-1" district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-40-67

Mr. Bill Phillippe, appeared on behalf of the Sun Oil Company, in regard to the petition to rezone property at 3017 S. Logan Street from "A" one family to "H" light industrial district.

Mr. Phillippe stated he thought the proposed zoning would be in conformance with the surrounding area. The reasons for the rezoning are; (1) to allow for the

existing use as a service station site and (2) they are presently negotiating with the dealers at the service station location for a possible sale of the property to them. If sold to them, they intend to add to the service station operation an outboard motor and boat sales and service which would require the "H" light industrial zoning classification.

Mr. Guernsey asked if there were a screening requirement if the petitioners would object to it, and Mr. Phillippe stated he did not think this would be a problem.

Mr. Reynolds suggested that perhaps the commercial classification would be sufficient, and Mr. Phillippe responded that the problem there would be the setback and use requirements.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-41-67

Mr. Donald MacRae, Architect, appeared on behalf of the petition to rezone the property at 900-1000 block of Platt Street, from "D" apartment to Community Unit Plan. The proposed plan by Miller-Davis Company is for the use of the property at the north end of Plat Street to be developed into a 14 story 200 unit residential apartment building for the elderly.

Mr. MacRae, explained the project in relation to the type of building, occupancy of such a building, the density, the location, the income limits to occupants, and stated he would be happy to answer any questions in regard to the project. He displayed a design concept of the proposed building.

Mr. Reynolds asked if Mr. MacRae was aware of the fact that this area is in the flood plain? Mr. MacRae replied that this fact was discussed in depth with Mr. Granger of the Water Resources Commission. Mr. Granger concurred that if the building was placed at a given elevation which would be several feet above the highest known flood level that it would be acceptable by the standards in that office.

Mr. Reynolds asked if this would be a turn key project, and Mr. MacRae answered the Miller-Davis Company submitted this zoning variance with the fact in mind that it would be a turn key project and there is a resolution from the Housing Commission to the effect that they are working with Miller-Davis Company to construct building providing the technicalities can be taken care of.

Mr. Thomas Pierson, 227 E. Hazel Street, stated that where he was located all he would be able to see would be a parking lot and parked autos. Mr. Warner Graf, architect, explained that there would be screening along the parking lot. Mr. Pierson asked about the increased

traffic, rise of taxes for property owners adjacent to the project.

Mrs. Ruth Barnard spoke in behalf of her mother Mrs. Lena Holloway, 225 E. Hazel Street, commented on the fire trucks entry to the proposed building, why some of these homes had been approached by Real Estate Company's as to whether the owners would be willing to sell, and the apartments will be strictly limited to low income level elderly.

Mr. MacRae replied that there were inquiries made through the Walter Neller Company, because if it were possible they would like to have the whole block. He explained that fire equipment could approach from the south up to Hazel Street from Clair Street. The project is restricted by statute to the elderly.

Daisy Bonnasch, 223 E. Hazel Street, stated that under no circumstances would she sell her home, and commented on the narrowness of Hazel Street.

Further discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-42-67

Dr. Belding appeared on behalf of the petition to rezone property at 5325 S. Cedar Street, from "A" one family to "F" commercial district.

Dr. Belding stated that the purpose of this petition is to revert the property to what it was before the property was annexed to the City. For 21 years there has been an animal hospital on this property. I would like to continue to operate and possibly expand my operation, and keep in conformance with the surrounding property which is "F" commercial.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-43-67

Mr. Glen Dean, 1321 E. North Street, appeared on behalf of the petition to rezone property at 820 and 822 N. Chestnut Street and 426 W. Madison Street, from "C-2" family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district. Mr. Dean stated he has taken listings on these three pieces of property for the purpose of selling them for multiple dwelling use. He submitted a letter from the Public Service Department stating that the sewers are adequate for multiple dwelling use, and also a letter from the Planning Director stating that the use based on the Master Plan would be "D-M" multiple dwelling. He contacted other people in the area and at the time there were no objections to the property being developed with multiple dwelling.

Mr. Siebert asked if there were any definite plans for the property, and Mr. Dean stated that there is no design submitted as yet, because of the irregular shape of the land.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-44-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property west of Ferral Street from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-45-67

Mr. Lester N. Turner, Attorney, appeared on behalf of the petitioner to rezone property at 317 Lincoln St., from "B-1" family to "D-M" multiple dwelling. He explained that the petitioner has operated a flower shop for approximately twenty years. She has recently been served papers by the Highway Department to vacate her property by July 1, 1967. Mr. Turner then explained the operation of the flower shop. He submitted a letter from the Highway Department, one from the Relocation Officer, and one from a neighbor of Mrs. Abent stating that they had no objections to the flower shop while they lived next door. Mr. Turner asked that the Board consider this petition at their mid-month meeting, May 16, 1967 because of the time element. Mrs. Abent was present.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee for consideration at the mid-month meeting on May 16, 1967.

Z-46-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property north of and adjacent to 5030 S. Washington Avenue, from "A" one family to "C-2" family.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-47-67

Dr. Badgeley, 624 N. Capitol Avenue appeared on behalf of the petition to rezone property at 2000, 2008, 2010 and 2016 W. Holmes Street from "A" one family to "D-1" professional offices district.

Dr. Badgeley stated that his property was sold to Lansing Community College, and that he had to vacate his present loca-

tion by September 1, 1967. Presented pictures which were on the subject property. Also presented the artists conception of the type of building they would like to place on the property.

Mr. Gaus asked the size of the proposed building, and Dr. Badgeley replied it would be 40 x 80 ft., two story, with basement.

No one appeared in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-48-67

Mr. John Burgen, representing Sinclair Refining Company, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property, at 1628 N. Grand River and 215 W. North Street, from "A" one family and "C-2" family to "E-2" drive-in district.

Mr. Burgen stated that they were anticipating purchasing and removing two houses. They proposed to spend 120 thousand dollars to build a modern service station. He presented a copy of the purchase option, a plot plan and a picture of what the service station should look like with the exception it would be three stalls instead of two.

Mr. Fink stated that the station would setback considerably from the street.

Mr. Heino asked if the petitioner had any objection to rezoning the present gas station to "E-2" drive-in, and the petitioner replied no objections whatsoever.

Mr. Guernsey asked if they had any objections to screening, and the petitioner replied that they did not.

No one appeared in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-49-67

Mr. Ted Prawdzik, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 3131 W. Mt. Hope Avenue, from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Mr. Prawdzik stated that the reason for rezoning was because of multiple development in the area and the expense that would be incurred to put in a street.

No one appeared in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

SS-13-65 Amendment to the Zoning
Ordinance

Mr. Guernsey read the proposed amendment to the Board which is as follows:

Sec. 36-42 Nonconforming uses

(10) Small animal hospital; provided however, such buildings occupy not over twenty-five percent of the total area of the lot and will not have any serious depreciating effect upon the value of the surrounding property; outside runs will be prohibited and provided further, the building shall be set back from all yard lines a distance of not less than two feet for each foot of building height, but at no time shall the yard requirements be less than what is required in the zoning district in which the property is located.

Under definitions the following would be added:

Small animal hospital, a place where household pets are given medical or surgical treatment. Use as a kennel shall be limited to short time boarding and shall only be incidental to such hospital use.

Matter was referred to the Ordinance Committee.

Sm-4-67

This is a request to divide Lot 498 of Pleasant Grove Subdivision located at the corner of Ingham and Herrick Streets and measures 80 ft. x 182 ft. The proposed division would create two lots. The size and orientation of the lots would be as follows:

Parcel A—66.5 ft. by 80 ft. or 5320 sq. feet, this lot would be oriented to Herrick Street.

Parcel B—80 ft. by 115.5 ft. or 9240 sq. feet, this lot contains an existing home and garage oriented to Ingham Street.

Mr. Fountain, planner, explained why the proposed lot split is contrary to the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Art VanKranenburg, owner of the property, appeared in behalf of his request.

Mr. Gary Loomis, 3311 Ingham Street objected to the lot split, because of the size of the lot proposed to be split, water drainage on his lot, small back yard if owner built on split lot. Mr. Loomis cited other cases of refused lot splits in the area.

Mr. Gerald Loomis, Pleasant Grove Road, objected the lot split since in the past several other people in the neighborhood tried to split their lots and they were refused, also to the size of the lots.

Further discussion of the water drainage problem.

Mr. Black pointed out that there is a difference in this lot and the other in that it fronts on two streets and it could be split with a direct access to an entirely different street.

Mr. Fink asked if this split would meet the minimum lot size required?

Mr. Guernsey replied that this split would not meet the requirements of 60 ft. x 100 ft. therefore it was referred to the Planning Board.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

Z-32-67

Mr. Ivan Bartha asked permission to speak in regard to the proposed rezoning of irregular piece of land abutting north of 820 Sycamore Street. Permission was granted by the Chairman of the Board. He referred to spot zoning in the city which was an objection to the proposed rezoning in the past, and also the hardship of the petitioner in this case.

Mr. Black commented that when this petition was previously considered he raised the question as to how large a building could be gotten on the site. Has a plan been worked up for this site showing the size and the location of the building and the parking?

Mr. Bartha replied that he had presented four or five alternatives each within the limits of the Ordinance.

Z-27-67

Mr. Trowbridge, 522 W. Hodge, stated he would like to sell the subject property located at 4526 S. Logan Street, which has been used for a gas station until it was annexed into the City. It then reverted to "A" one residential. It has been used as a gas station for 17 years and the prospective buyer of the property wants to buy it zoned for a gas station, not as a residential property.

Recess from 9:40 to 10:09 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-32-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to the City Council that the petition by Stanley Jennings, to rezone a parcel in the North of 820 Sycamore Street described as:

All that part of Lots 21 of Block No. 1 of U. F. Barnes Subdivision on

Block 27, Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, as recorded in Liber 1 of plats, page 56, Ingham County Records, which lies Southeasterly of a line 45 feet South-easterly of (measured at right angles) and paralleled to a line described as:

Beginning at a point on the centerline of Chicago Avenue which is 20 feet North along said centerline from its intersection with the centerline of Oakland Avenue thence South 88 deg. 27' 32" East, parallel with the centerline of Oakland Avenue, a distance of 223.20 feet to the point of curvature of a 1145.92 foot radius curve to the left (chord bearing North 81 deg. 00' 35" East); thence Northeasterly along the arc of said curve 421.25 ft. to the point of tangency of said curve; thence North 70 deg. 28' 43" East a distance of 278.61 ft. to the point of curvature of a 1145.92 foot radius curve to the right (chord bearing North 81 deg. 02' 35" East); thence East along the arc of said curve 422.48 ft. to the point of tangency of said curve and a point of ending. Contains 9,070 square feet more or less

from "C" two family to "D-1" professional district be denied.

This site is an irregular shaped parcel of land which was created by the extension of Oakland Avenue through this area. The property has been deed restricted to eliminate access to Oakland Street.

Land use in the area is residential, ranging from one to four family dwellings. The site and surrounding area is zoned "C" two family residential.

The requested change would be contrary to the established land use pattern and could lead to further requests for non-residential zoning along this major street. This type of development reduces the traffic carrying capacity of major streets.

There are several areas zoned or indicated as desirable professional office areas in the Central City Development Plan.

Un-coordinated office developments scattered throughout the central city decline values in adjacent residential properties and weakens the market potential of logical and desirable office areas.

It would appear that this site cannot be developed in accordance with the zoning ordinance requirements for professional office districts. All plans submitted by the petitioner violate the yard and parking requirements.

It is possible to develop the site within the limits of the present zoning classification.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-28-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Kenneth B. and Gloria L. Brown, to rezone a parcel at the rear of 919 Reo Road, 933 Reo Road, 921 Reo Road and 935 Reo Road, described as:

W. 42.74 ft. of E. 45.26 ft. Lot 41, exc. N. 175 ft. Sonnenberg's Half Acre Subdivision

E. 2.52 ft. Lot 41 also Lot 40 exc. E. 5.04 ft. exc. N. 175 ft. Sonnenberg's Half Acre Subdivision

W. 37.70 ft. Lot 39 and E. 5.04 ft. Lot 40, exc. N. 175 ft. Sonnenberg's Half Acre Subdivision

W. 42.74 ft. Lot 41, exc. N. 175 ft. Sonnenberg's Half Acre Subdivision

from "A" one family to "C-2" family district be denied at this time.

Zoning of the property is premature at this time.

The site under consideration does not have proper frontage on a public street to provide for development.

Sewer facilities to serve the site will not be available until the property to the south is developed.

If the proposed housing development south of this site does not materialize this change could be out of context with any alternate proposal for the area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-13-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Elton E. Tubbs, to rezone a parcel at 2009 W. Holmes Rd., from "A" one residential to "D-M" multiple dwelling district, be denied as filed and that the property be zoned "C-2" family district.

"D-M" multiple zoning as requested will allow a density of 29 dwelling units per acre. The Community Unit Plan project under development to the west and south of this site was approved by the Planning

Board and City Council at a density of 12 dwelling units per acre. The Committee believes that the 12 units per acre density should be retained in this area.

The Committee further considered the single family development east of the subject property and believes that two-family zoning would be a proper transition between the existing single family development and the professional office and apartment development to the west.

The Board believes that the policy of 12 dwelling units per acre should be maintained as pointed out by adjacent property owners.

Mr. Fink stated he was concerned that if sometime in the future someone thinks this should be commercial, then a strip commercial would be started as Cedar Street is now. He questioned if this is the wisest approach at this time. There is justification for looking into a higher intensity use than what is now proposed.

Further discussion followed on the density in the area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: Fink—1.

Z-14-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Maurice E. Albertson, to rezone a parcel at 2013 W. Holmes Road, from "A" one residential to "D-M" multiple dwelling district, be denied as filed and that the property be zoned "C-2" family district.

"D-M" multiple dwelling zoning as requested will allow a density of 29 dwelling units per acre. The Community Unit Plan project under development to the west and south of this site was approved by the Planning Board and City Council at a density of 12 dwelling units per acre. The Committee believes that the 12 unit per acre density should be retained in this area.

The Committee further considered the single family development east of the subject property and believes that two-family zoning would be a proper transition between the existing single family development and the professional office and apartment development to the west.

The Board believes that the policy of 12 dwelling units per acre should be maintained as pointed out by adjacent property owners.

Motion carried by the following votes:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: Fink—1.

Z-17-67

Motion by Siebert, second by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the property at 5334 S. Cedar Street, described as:

Beginning at a point 1040.6 ft. S. and 764 ft. E. of the N. $\frac{1}{4}$ corner Section 4, T3N, R2W, thence E. 554.35 to the center of the highway US 127 thence S. 502.5 along the center of said US 127 thence W. 556 ft. thence N. 502.5 ft. to the point of beginning

from "D" apartment and "J" parking district to "D-M" multiple dwelling district, be granted.

This parcel was zoned by the City Council with a favorable recommendation from the Planning Board in June of 1965.

The petitioner submitted plans at that time for a nursing home. The Board recommended approval of the request for the following reasons:

1. The type of use proposed for the site will not be completely out of character with the uses in the area.
2. Much of the development along this area of Cedar St. is contrary to the Master Plan.
3. The site is within easy walking distance of a commercial center.

Since the time of this rezoning the petitioner has found a new site for the nursing home and as such the Committee believes that the density allowed in the "D" apartment zone would be excessive if used for other than a nursing home.

The "D-M" density in contrast, would be more in line with the existing and proposed use in the area.

Mr. Gaus asked why a community unit plan was not considered for this property?

Mr. Fink replied that what the Staff is recommending reduces the density.

Further discussion on density followed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Gaus and Siebert—6.

Nays: Reynolds—1.

Z-27-67

Motion by Siebert, second by Heino, that the petition to rezone property located at

4526 S. Logan Street, from "A" one family to "E-2" drive-in district be tabled for thirty (30) days to permit further study.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-29-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the request for withdrawal of the petition by Irvin Van Sluyters to rezone a parcel at 3200 Ellen Avenue described as:

Lot No. 63, Plat of Cedarbrook, a Subdivision of South part of E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of S.E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of Section 28, and West part of South part of S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 27, T4N, R2W, Lansing Township, now City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one residential district to "D-1" professional district be accepted and that the property remain in its present classification.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-30-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Ike Talison and Lillie Mae Tailson, to rezone a parcel at 1305 Greenwood, from "A" one family to "C-2" family district be denied.

The site is located on the corner of Rose-lawn and Greenwood, in the center of a single family residential neighborhood.

The proposed change of zoning would create an isolated district unrelated to adjacent districts; i.e., this would be a "spot" zone. If this change of zoning were granted it would be difficult if not impossible to deny similar changes on adjacent properties and ultimately go down the street. Soon there would be an intermingling of uses, thus defeating one of the basic purposes for which the zoning ordinance was developed to implement the comprehensive plan.

Conversion of the garage would make it an integral part of the structure and it appears that yards would be substandard. If this is the case a variance would have to be petitioned for to the Board of Zoning Appeals.

The neighborhood is stable and a change of zoning to allow a higher density could destroy this stability. The lots, homes, sewers, streets, were designed and de-

veloped for a density of approximately 6 to 7 dwelling units per acre. Two family zoning would permit a density of 12 to 14 dwelling units per acre which is completely out of character with the area.

The change of zoning would confer upon the petitioner a special privilege as contrasted to the general welfare of the community.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with the existing zoning.

There is a substantial amount of land zoned for this type of use.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-31-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by William M. Forgrave, President of Miracle Mile Inc., to rezone a parcel at the East side of Richwood Street, South of Louisa Street described as:

South 37 feet of Lot 28 and all of Lots 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34 Richfield Park

from "A" residential and "G-2" wholesale to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be granted.

The petitioner has indicated that the extra depth is not needed for warehousing and therefore wishes to develop these lots with multiple dwellings oriented to Richwood Streets.

The Committee further recommends that the balance of Lot 28 Richfield Park Subd., and Lots 30, 31, and 32 of Supervisor's Plat No. 3 be rezoned from "A" one family to "G-2" wholesale to "D-M" multiple. This change would bring the property into conformance with the balance of the zoning along Richwood Street and Louisa Street.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-34-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Robert L. Freeman and Robert W. Smith, to rezone a parcel at 900 N. Capitol Avenue,

from "D-M" multiple dwelling to "D-1" professional offices district be denied.

There should be compelling reasons for any rezoning amendment which is substantially related to the public welfare and necessity. It is not sufficient that an applicant for an amendment merely show that there is no neighborhood objection, nor is it sufficient that a petitioner show that an amendment would enable him to gain an economic benefit from his property. With these points in mind the following analysis is made.

The site is located on the Northeast corner of Capitol Avenue and Oakland Street.

The existing land use is predominantly residential, ranging from one to four family dwellings. There are two "non-conforming" uses in this block of Capitol Avenue. This change of zoning would be out of character with the neighborhood, and would constitute a "spot" zone. Indiscriminate spot zoning of residential property generally creates parking problems and incompatible land use relationships; stimulating further requests for marginal development thus weakening the market potential of more logical and desirable office areas.

There are several areas within the Central City Development Plan.

The Committee believes that office zoning should be concentrated in the core area, as shown on the Central City Plan rather than extended North into the established residential neighborhood.

The particular property is very small (66 ft. x 82 ft.) and the minimum parking requirement could not be provided.

The basic land use conditions have not changed in this area, therefore, there are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in conformance with the existing zoning.

Discussion of parking requirements followed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: Gaus—1.

Z-36-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Gerald E. Chrisenberry, Donald R. Wolfe and John E. Wolfe, to rezone a parcel at South Logan at Holmes Road described as:

Commencing at the Northeast corner of Section 32, T4N, R2W, City

of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, thence S. $89^{\circ} 49'$ W. 1242.0 ft. on the section line to the easterly right-of-way line of Logan St., thence Southerly 422.0 ft. on said right-of-way line and 50 ft. from centerline thereof to the point of beginning; running thence S. $88^{\circ} 33'$ E. 120.0 ft., thence Southerly 120.0 ft. parallel with Logan St., thence N. $86^{\circ} 33'$ W. 120.0 ft., thence Northerly 120.0 ft. on the east right-of-way to the point of beginning

from "J" parking to "F" commercial district be denied.

There is adequate land zoned within the commercial complex to accommodate the proposed use.

The area North and East of the existing discount store and food market is zoned "F" commercial and undeveloped.

The proposed change would be contrary to the basic principals that are considered for shopping center development.

Commercial use should comprise integrated groups of stores, rather than string development along major streets.

Pedestrians should be offered a means of circulation with a minimum of vehicular interference.

The proposed change would promote additional points of vehicular ingress and egress off Logan St., and would jeopardize the safety and flow of traffic along the major streets.

The basic shopping center patterns are outlined as follows on the attached.

The proposed change is contrary to these basic patterns and if approved would encourage further developments of this nature into existing and proposed shopping centers throughout the City.

Any further division of land within this shopping complex should be preceeded by platting of the land.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-38-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Julian F. Burt, to rezone a parcel at 2100 Turner Street described as:

Com. N.E. corner int'n Turner St. and Moseley Ave. the NWly on Ely line Turner St. 262.7 ft. ± to point 3

ft. SE'ly of S.W. corner North Gardens Subd. E. 120 ft. NW'ly to S.E. corner Lot 130, North Gardens Sub. E. 267.8 ft., S. 281 ft. to N. line Mosely Ave., W. 253.9 ft. to beg.; Section 4 T4N, R2W

from "D-M" multiple dwelling to "A" one residential district be granted.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as medium density (4-10 dwelling units per net acre). The density allowed in the "D-M" (29 dwelling units per net acre) is out of character with the Master Plan recommendations.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-105-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the request for screening along the east line of Lot No. 6, Block No. 2 McPhersons Saginaw Street Addition not be recommended as requested by Mr. Fred Barberio.

The Board believes that the land use changes in this area have made this block less desirable for residential use, and that screening enforcement would not effectively alleviate the entire problem the resident of the property is confronted with.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

S-1-67F

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that City Council be advised the Planning Board at their meeting on May 2, 1967, approved the Final Plat of Orchardvale Subdivision and the Board recommends that it be approved by City Council subject to the following conditions:

That subdivision be improved with complete public utilities including sanitary sewer, storm sewer, water and complete street improvements including paving, curb and gutter and sidewalks.

The posting of financial security in the amount of:

Sidewalks	\$2,500
Monuments	80
Total	\$2,580

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Acts of 1929 as amended shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

S-15-66F-6

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that City Council be advised the Planning Board at their meeting on May 2, 1967, approved the Final Plat of Sunset Hill No. 6 and the Board recommends that it be approved by City Council subject to the following conditions:

The subdivision shall be improved with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewer, storm sewer and full street improvements including paving, curb and gutter, and sidewalks.

The posting of financial security in the amount of:

Sidewalk	\$3,800
Curb and Gutter	240
Monuments	160
Total	\$3,700

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All other standards and requirements of Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Acts of 1929, as amended, shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Sm-4-67

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the request to divide Lot 498 Pleasant Grove Subdivision requested by Mr. Art Van Kranenburg, be denied for the following reasons:

The substandard Lots created would be completely out of character with the Lots in the area.

If this request were granted, it could establish a precedent which might prompt owners of similar Lots to seek the same privilege.

It is doubtful that the Lot could be developed in accordance with the yard requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that Z-35-67 and Z-45-67 be placed on the Planning Board Agenda for the mid-month meeting of May 16, 1967.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

BUILDING AND PROPERTY

BP-2-67

Request to purchase from the City of Lansing Lots No. 46 and No. 47 of Assessor's Plat No. 49.

Mr. Guernsey gave an explanation of the request. He stated that State law requires that the Planning Board consider this request before final action is taken.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds reported that if the land was available it could be filled. There is as yet no final decision on a Redevelopment Director.

FINANCE

Motion by Fink, seconded by Siebert, that \$500.00 be transferred from Account No. 170440 office equipment, to Account No. 170122 part-time help, and that \$240 be transferred from Account No. 170441 new equipment to office expense Account No. 170301.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Traffic Study

Mr. Guernsey reported on a meeting regarding the possible scope of services for a consultant for a Central City traffic study. Purpose of the meeting was to examine the current studies and date available from the Tri-County Regional Transportation Program.

He then reported that the Council Planning Committee has been appointed by the Mayor which is as follows: Frank Perrin, Chairman, Lucile Belen, Vice Chairman and new member Delmer Smith.

RE: Z-138-65

Letter from Bruce M. Hartwick requesting amendment to Community Unit Plan at 2431 N. Grand River Avenue.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

ROW-22-66

Letter from Irwin Bromley, The Manor House, read to the Board by Mr. Guernsey. This letter is in opposition to the extension of the drive through Scott Park.

Received and placed on file.

Letters from Dr. William Manning, Supt., Lansing Public School and from Mr. Ray Jusick, were read to the Board by Mr. Guernsey. Received and placed on file.

Z-1-66

2330 Forest Road, rezoning petition by George Parisian referred back from City Council for consideration under Community Unit Plan.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Meeting adjourned at 11:22 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

N/M

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, June 6, 1967

Meeting was called to order by Chairman Bretz at 7:47 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Absent: Fink and Manz—2.

PETITIONERS PRESENTATION

Z-35-67

This is a request to rezone property located at the 2800 Block of S. Logan Street from "A" one to "G-2" wholesale district.

Mr. Lindell stated that this is New York Central property and they have nothing to do with it.

Mr. Guernsey explained that the Planning Board is considering a zoning for the area, a portion of which property is owned by Lindell Drop Forge, located to the west of the plant.

Mr. Lindell stated that they cannot tolerate this, because we have plans for the property. We are opposed.

Mr. Allison Thomas, attorney representing Lansing Wholesale Grocers Company, stated that since the last meeting they have secured an option to purchase the adjoining property, which was presented to the Board. The option to purchase property would provide for an access to angle off Logan Street which would eliminate any direct route onto Victor Street. Mr. Thomas emphasized the following points in favor of this petition: (1) highest and best of the land; (2) the creation of a buffer zone between the forge and the residential property; (3) improvement to area which is now vacant and not taken care of; (4) tax rate base will be increased; (5) Lansing Wholesale Grocery will be able to stay within the City of Lansing. We have tried to remedy the objections of both the Planning Board and the residential property owners.

Mr. Robert Boatman, resident of the area, stated he was speaking for a group

of residents on South Holly Way. He referred to the letter stating objections of the group which was submitted to the Board at the May 16, 1967 Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Robert Baker, General Manager of the Lansing Wholesale Grocers, stated they are not asking for industrial zoning, but "G-2" wholesale, which is warehousing. Mr. Baker reiterated the Wholesale Grocers feelings in favor of this proposed rezoning.

Discussion following.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

S-15-68 Final Plat of Marscot Meadows No. 3

D. Gregory Main discussed the location, land use in the area of the proposed subdivision. He explained that this subdivision was given tentative approval in 1964 at which time no public hearing was held; therefore this public hearing tonight is to comply with State law. He proceeded to give the size and proposed use.

Mr. Soderberg, 500 Doris Street, owns property adjoining the proposed development. He stated he would like to correct the misconception about Secor Street not being developed. I bought my property in 1946 and some years before this it had been developed and used by farm machinery as a roadway. I would recommend that the old Secor Street not be vacated, but be permitted to be used as a street connecting to Secor and possibly be developed in some other manner when the surrounding ground may be developed at a future date.

Mr. Gaus asked if when the State bought property for I-96 which made Mr. Soderberg landlocked, was he compensated for this? Mr. Soderberg replied, that there was no payment made to him or any offer of access for his property.

Mr. Gaus asked if Floyd Street was ever developed, and Mr. Soderberg replied that it was never developed as a street.

Further discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

S-5-67P Four Seasons, Preliminary Plat

D. Gregory Main presented the location, land use in the area, proposed use and the access to the proposed subdivision.

Mr. William VanDuzer, 3714 Cooley Drive, questioned if the parking had been removed from the property line of the owners along Cooley Drive, and whether York Street would be open during the development of the plat. Mr. Beneicke, one of the developers of the project, stated that part of the parking was removed from directly behind the property line, and there will be live screening. Mr. Guernsey stated that York Street would not be open during the construction of the plat. Mr. VanDuzer then asked since York Street is primarily for the benefit of this development, where is the cost going to be levied? Mr. Guernsey replied that all costs of the project will be levied to this plat. Mr. VanDuzer then asked about the portion of York Street that goes from the plat to Cooley Street, and Mr. Guernsey replied that portion of the street would be the obligation of the City, including curb improvements.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

S-6-67P Preliminary Plat of RND Industrial Park

D. Gregory Main discussed the location, proposed use, and the land use in the area of the proposed subdivision.

The developer was not present.

No one appeared in opposition to the proposed development.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

S-7-67P Preliminary Plat of Penn Cedar Subdivision

D. Gregory Main gave the location, proposed use of the property and the land use in the area.

Mr. Robert Bear, property owner on Glenwood Street, asked the proposed date of construction of this property? Mr. Main replied that to his knowledge there was no date set, that it would be two to three months before the platting procedures are completed.

Matter referred to the Streets Committee.

S-8-67 Preliminary Plat of Dunkel Interchange Subdivision

D. Gregory Main discussed the location, proposed use of the property, present zoning in the area.

Mr. Guernsey asked if this plat was recorded as a part of the zoning procedure, Mr. Main replied that when City Council rezoned this property, it was subject to platting.

Mr. Joe Pentecost stated he was the recorder of the subject plat, that it is a condition of the zoning and that he was present to answer any questions that may be asked in regard to the subject plat.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

Z-214-65

Mr. Leo Farhat, Attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 3831 Moores River Drive and 3500-3800 Cooley Drive, from "A" one family to Community Unit Plan.

William Bechtel discussed the location, proposed development of the property.

Mr. Farhat stated he was representing the petitioners in this case. He stated that this matter had been heard some time ago and at that time the Planning Board and City Council denied the zoning but recommended consideration as a Community Unit Plan. Drawings in this regard have been submitted to the Staff and we urge the Board to approve the Community Unit Plan as proposed with such modifications as it deems advisable. He further stated that he understood that there were people in objection to the parking as proposed in the Community Unit and that after conference with his clients, that if the Board so desires they will rearrange the parking to suit the Board's approval.

Discussion followed in regard to the proposed parking and the intersection of Moores River and Waverly Roads.

Mr. Black stated he thought it would be a mistake to permit the development of this property until a decision is made on the Moores River Drive-Waverly Road intersection. He commented on the traffic situation at this intersection.

Mr. Farhat pointed out that they had been trying to get action on the Moores River Drive establishment since last August.

Mr. Black expressed his doubts as to the wisdom of this petition.

Mr. William VanDuzer, representing himself and a neighbor, stated his objections to the proposal in regard to the parking, which with proper and live screening with the parking lot moved away from the property line, would be acceptable. He also objected to the density and the present status of the intersection, which he believes warrants further study. He wanted it made clear that if Beneicke and Krue can use their land to the highest and best use as a multiple unit then so can Mr. McCurdy.

Mr. Farhat commented in regard to the density, in that the dwelling to be left on the property is a single unit. He further asked if it would be practical to request the Board to suggest to Public Service and Traffic Departments to cut a passageway through the island in regard to the Waverly-Moores River Drive intersection.

Mr. Richard Beneicke, developer of the adjacent property, stated that it is their feeling that when they developed their site they did it with much less concentration of density than is involved here. We do not object to a Community Unit Plan for the land involved, but we feel that more study might be given to the development.

Mr. Clement Cormier, 3400 Cooley Drive, objected to the development in that he bought in a residential district thinking it would be one family homes, and also to the difficulties of the intersection.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-1-66

Mr. Parisian, one of the developers of the proposed project, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 2330 Forest Road, from "A" one family to Community Unit Plan.

William Bechtel discussed the location, size, and proposed use of the property, and existing land use in the area.

Mr. Emil Kletke, 3016 Manley Drive, spoke in objection to the proposed amendment because of the density, no existing outlet at the south end, the sewer capacity, and school capacity in the area.

Mr. Joseph Bardon, 3106 Stoneleigh Drive, stated that when he bought his lot in the area he understood it would be all "A" one residential, that there should be open area and grass, not fair to people already established in the area, and he objects most strongly to the whole concept of the proposal.

Mr. Ed O'Shesky spoke in objection to the proposal.

Mr. James Harmon, 2315 Wabash Road, objected to the proposal in that he thought there would be a severe surplus water problem, and that the sanitary sewer system is not capable of handling the proposed density. Mr. Harmon also stated his concern in regard to possible fire hazards.

Mrs. Phillips, 2330 Forest Road, asked for a clarification on the location of the proposed project, the site was pointed out to her by Mr. Bechtel.

Mr. Allen Trapp, 3106 Manley Drive, stated his concerns were the same as the others had stated, but also he was con-

cerned about the safety of the children in the immediate area.

Mr. Joseph Hobria, 2733 Manley Drive, commented in regard to the size of the residential lots, and the estimated number of people there would be in the proposed development, the traffic generated by these people, and stated he thought this would create quite an intensive contrast in land use between what they have now and what is proposed for the area.

Harold Teddy, 3024 Manley Drive, stated he wanted to go on record as being opposed to the development as it is proposed. He stated that when he moved in to this neighborhood it was "A" one residential, and the development such as this would not be compatible to the area.

Harold Slater, 3006 Manley Drive, asked what the Master Plan designates for the subject area?

Mr. Guernsey replied that the Master Plan shows the area for single family development, that the Planning Board has adopted this as part of the Master Plan policy.

Maynard Kenyon, 3204 Manley Drive, stated he was opposed to the proposed development because it changes the atmosphere of the neighborhood, that the people moved there to get out of the city, and that they prefer it as it is.

Mrs. Len Stuttman, 2331 Forest Road, stated she was against this proposed development. That more open space areas are needed, that she understood that low cost housing is needed, but that this is not the place for it.

Mrs. Kenyon, 3204 Manley Drive, commented in regard to being charged for sewer, and thought that if this development went in, that they would be charged for sidewalk, and also that their property would devalue.

Chairman Bretz, asked for a show of hands of those persons interested in this proposal. There were approximately 25 people present in regard to this matter, with about twenty people in opposition to the proposal.

One of the developers of the proposed project stated that these proposed units are to be small apartments. He compared the density of the proposed units as to if the property was developed with single family lots. We feel we will be helping the neighborhood. These would be attractive units, with lots of green area, nicely landscaped and taken care of. This is not a turn key type of project. We plan on hiring a manager to insure the units being taken care of.

Mrs. Stuttman asked about the parking plan for the proposed development. The developer replied that they are thinking in terms of carports, but whatever is done we

are concerned about the surrounding people. If it is desirable we will display the final drawings.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-50-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone the property at 2919 Aurelius Road, from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-51-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 684 Carrier Street, from "A" one family to "C-2" family district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-52-67

Mr. Harry Thompson, Manager for Lansing Farm Products Company, appeared on behalf of the petition to rezone property at 3055 E. Michigan Avenue, from "A" one family to "F" commercial and "J" parking district.

Mr. Thompson stated that when this petition was filed he neglected to ask for "J" parking district on Michigan Avenue from where the building exists to the property line.

The matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-53-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone the property at 700 River Street, from "D" apartment district to "F" commercial district.

Mr. Guernsey stated that this property is located in the 1947 flood plain and the Central City plan indicated that this land be developed with townhouses and high rise apartment uses.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-54-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone the property at 400 S. Butler Street, from "D" apartment district to "F" commercial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-55-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone the property at 833 N. Capitol, from "D-M" multiple dwelling district to "D-1" professional district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-56-67

Mr. Leo Farhat, Attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 2230 Dunlap Street, from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Mr. Farhat stated that this rezoning has been requested to permit the construction of a 12 unit apartment house as demonstrated by the drawing he submitted to the Board.

The lot is rather unusual in shape and is 66 ft. by 305 ft. An illustration was submitted showing the development adjacent to the subject property. It is the intention of the petitioner to remove the shack now on the property to build the 12 unit apartment house. Mr. Farhat referred to a newspaper article concerning the mixing of one family homes and apartment houses in one area, suggesting that as an alternative to spot zoning to rezone the entire area, if this is what it would take to get this particular piece of property rezoned. If this petition was granted, I think the City, the area, and the petitioner would be benefited.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-57-67

Mr. Leo Farhat, Attorney, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 3328 W. Jolly Road, from "C-2" family to "F" commercial district.

The original request on this property was "D-M" but the Board recommended the "C-2". We are asking the Board to reconsider on the "D-M" in the light of recent developments, that is the possibility of a trend developing to permitting a mixture of development as I have previously mentioned. This matter has been discussed with Mr. Guernsey and members of the Council Committee on Planning, and I was under the impression this property could possibly be rezoned "D-M" subject to a deed restriction.

In support of this belief two deeds were prepared and forwarded to City Council, restricting the property to a development

which was suggested, I believe a 16 unit development. These deeds were recorded by the City of Lansing, and after the recording the City Council rezoned the property to "C-2" family. Why this was done, escapes me. I thought the proper way to bring this matter to the Board and City Council was to resubmit this petition. Also I hope the Board might reconsider this petition in light of the recent trends indicated.

Mr. Guernsey commented that the Planning Committee of Council did consider this request in light of the deed restrictions, but they did not concur with the request so it was therefore zoned "C-2" district.

Mr. Farhat stated that he would like the City Council to review their action or else give us a quit claim deed.

Further discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-58-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 2227 W. Miller Road, from "A" one family to "F" commercial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-59-67

Mr. Leo Farhat, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 3831 Moores River Drive and 3500-3800 Cooley Drive, from "A" one family to "C-2" family district.

Mr. Farhat stated it was his impression that Lot 29 is zoned "C-2" family, and that at this time I would like to advise the Board that the request to rezone Lot No. 17 is being withdrawn, in that the property owner decided to build a one family dwelling. This property was the subject of consideration by the Planning Board and City Council and because of an error in the posting the action on these lots was rescinded and then it was posted properly, at which time at the public hearing there were objections by people in the area. Mr. Farhat commented in regard to a deed restriction which was presented at the public hearing on this matter.

Further discussion followed.

Mr. William Van Duzer, Cooley Drive, stated that he is opposed to this "C-2" family petition. At the previous public hearing before Council, every property owner on the street was represented in opposition to the proposed amendment. This is a single family area and we op-

pose this and will continue to oppose multiple dwellings here. Four property owners present opposing this petition tonight.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-60-67

Mr. H. C. Cannon, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 1033, 1035, 1039 S. Pennsylvania and 1011 E. Hazel Street, from "C-2" family to "E-2" drive-in district.

Mr. H. C. Cannon submitted pictures of the proposed service station, and commented that the area has been undergoing a transition away from residential uses. Mr. Cannon discussed the present zoning in the immediate area of the subject property.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-61-67

Mr. Leo Farhat, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 100 Block of East Saginaw Street, from "D-1" professional to "G" business district.

Mr. Farhat stated he was representing the petitioner in this case and that this matter was also before the Board previously. He commented on the background of this petition. He asked that the Board consider this petition for rezoning to "G" business so that the petitioners can place their office building on the property.

Mr. Guernsey pointed out that the City Council considered more than the recommendations of the Board of Appeals in this matter. The Planning Boards recommendation that the property in this area be zoned "D-1" professional was considered in light of the changing conditions of the surrounding land use.

Mr. Farhat stated that he is convinced that the proposed five story office building is not going to adversely affect the Lansing Community College.

Mrs. Bretz suggested that Mr. Farhat file the plans with the Zoning Committee, that nothing could be settled tonight. Mr. Gaus stated he would like to be present when the plans are presented.

Further discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-62-67

Mr. Al Rahfeldt, representing the petitioner, Mrs. Brandels, appeared in behalf

of the petition to rezone property at 530 Community Street, from "A" one family to "C-2" family district.

Mr. Rahfeldt stated that this rezoning is necessary in order for the petitioner to support herself. The petitioner's mother asked for the Board's consideration in this petition.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-63-67

Claude Lapp, representing Homer Taylor, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone vacant property located at Hazelwood and Dunckel Roads, from "A" one family to "G-2" wholesale district.

Mr. Lapp stated that warehousing would be the highest and best use of this area along the west side of Dunckel Road, that this area does not appear to be desirable for residential building. Several loan institutions had been contacted in regard to loan commitments if people wanted to build in this area, and their position in general was that the area especially the west side of Dunckel was not desirable for homes, that they would go about 60% mortgage loans.

Mr. Gaus asked if the petition was for speculation or if Mr. Lapp had a tenant for the property, and Mr. Lapp replied that they have a tenant for the property, an overhead door company who wants to build an office and warehouse on the property.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-64-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 4918 Pleasant Grove Road, from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling or "C-2" family district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-65-67

Major Christian Anderson, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 1501 Windsor Avenue from "A" one family to "B-1" family district.

Major Anderson stated that the present building facility on the site is inadequate in size, it needs improved sanitary facilities, and it needs improvement in exit and entrance facilities. We desire to add 14 feet to the length of the building and improve its asthetic qualities by improving

its architectural design. In order to effect the improvements it is necessary to secure a rezoning. The lot size is 60 ft. by 124 ft.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-66-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 215 N. Holmes, from "C-2" family to "J" parking district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-67-67

Mr. James Weller, 119 Fenton Street, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 4728 and 4732 Hughes Road, from "A" one family to "C-2" family district.

Mr. Weller pointed out that there are several duplexes in the area as well as one family residences, and some commercial properties. If this rezoning is approved and the property developed with two duplexes there would be a common drive down the middle so there would be more green or open area.

Melvin Barnes, 301 Fenton Avenue, owner of Lot 117, just east of the property in question, stated he had no objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-68-67

Mr. Curtis Welty, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 613 W. Kalamazoo Street, from "D" apartment to "E" apartment district. Mr. Welty stated he was a transportation consultant, and that his present location in Lansing is going to be torn down so he purchased the subject property about a year ago with the intent purpose of converting the first floor into office space for himself. Later found out to do this, I need rezoning. Mr. Welty commented on the land use in the surrounding area, stating that he communicated almost daily with state office buildings so he needed to be within walking distance of them. Since purchase of the building, I have invested in repairs, and estimate I will spend fifteen to twenty thousand more remodeling on both the outside and inside of the building, if this rezoning is approved. This will greatly improve the area. As I understand it my problem has primarily to do with the City's Master Plan which outlines the area as apartment use. There should be some provision to the southern side of the capitol complex

for offices and other service shops. The property two parcels to the west has recently been rezoned to "E" apartment which is also my request and I ask for the same consideration.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-71-67

Frank Huxtable, representing Foster King, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 722-728 N. Pennsylvania Avenue, from "C-2" family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Mr. Huxtable stated that the houses now on the property are old and are bringing in very little income, so the present owner thought it would be to his advantage, and to the advantage of the City if this property could be rezoned. There are similar other facilities in the immediate area. Across the street is a new multiple dwelling down one block, and we don't see any reasons why the City should not grant this request, so we are respectfully submitting it.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-72-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 1313 and 1315 E. Main Street, from "B-1" family to "C-2" family district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-73-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 2236 North Grand River Avenue, from "A" one family to "F" commercial and "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-74-67

Mr. Alan Ginsberg, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at the northeast corner of Holmes and Logan Streets, from commercial and "J" parking to commercial and "J" parking district redistributed.

Mr. Ginsberg stated he was one of the owners of the subject property. At the time of purchase they understood it was zoned a combination of "J" parking and commercial and at this time we ask that

this same zoning be realigned. We are local developers and have developed the other two Yankee stores. We have signed leases on the property and are in a position to commence construction within a ten day period of zoning being approved.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-75-67

Jack Nichols, real estate representative for Mobile Oil, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 715-721 S. Pennsylvania and 1009 E. St. Joseph Street, from "C-2" family to "E-2" drive-in district.

Mr. Nichols stated that the subject properties are presently occupied by three single family residences. Our company proposes to buy the subject sites and develop a gas station on the northeast corner.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-76-67

Mr. Arnold Kegebein, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 912, 922, 924 S. Pennsylvania Avenue, from "C-2" family to "E-2" drive-in district.

Mr. Kegebein stated he believed there is a definite need in the future for service for the traffic that will be on the highway. This is the southwest corner of I-496 and Pennsylvania Avenue and we have several major oil companies negotiating for this corner. Mr. Kegebein presented a picture of the proposed service station to the Board, that would go on the northeast corner of this intersection.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-77-67

Mr. Arnold Kegebein, appeared in regard to the petition, to rezone property at 921 E. St. Joseph and 712-720 S. Pennsylvania Avenue, from "C-2" family to "E-2" drive-in district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-78-67

Mr. Joe Pentecost, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 6045 S. Cedar Street, from "E-2" drive-in to "E-1" drive-in district.

Mr. Pentecost stated that this property is presently zoned on the front portion "E-2" and the rear portion is "A" one. We are requesting "E-1" for a burger chef restaurant consisting of 110 inside seats. We need about the front 200 feet approximately rezoned "E-1". Mr. Pentecost presented building plans and photos of the proposed restaurant. He stated there would be in excess of 50 parking places. There is approximately thirty thousand square feet.

Further discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

RE: Z-35-67

Mr. Robert Baker, Wholesale Grocers Company, stated that the Board showed concern over the amount of rail that they would cross Logan. He talked to the State Highway and they said that with what we are contemplating this doesn't make sense, that this is very minor. Also there was some talk about the amount of customers that would utilize this. This would be an average of approximately 65 a day at the present time. With the cash and carry this could go up to about 100 with the main warehouse by 1970.

Recess from 9:58 to 10:17.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-35-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by B. R. Leahy, Real Estate Agent for New York Central Railroad, to rezone a parcel in the 2800 block South Logan Street described as:

That part of N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 29 lying N. of NYCR R/W also commencing in center of Section 29, thence W. 200 ft. S. 872 ft., SWly parallel with RR R/W to W. $\frac{1}{4}$ line, S. to R.R. R/W, NEly to N. and S. $\frac{1}{4}$ line, N. to beg.; Section 29 also the 66 ft. strip of land lying between Holmes Road and Logan St. and being in the N. $\frac{1}{2}$, S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$, the E. $\frac{1}{2}$, S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ and the W. $\frac{1}{2}$, S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 29, T4N, R2W

from "A" one family to "G-2" wholesale district be denied.

The proposed use would generate additional traffic at a critical intersection on Logan Street.

There is land zoned within the City that will accommodate the proposed use.

This would be a direct encroachment on the existing residential development in the area.

The sewers that would serve this development are combined storm and sanitary and operating near capacity.

This change would have a material effect on the future development along Holmes Road and the adjacent residential property.

There was heated discussion by both opponents and proponents concerning this matter.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nay: None.

Further discussion followed.

Z-47-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board advise City Council that the petition by W. O. Badgley, M.D., to rezone a parcel at 2000, 2008, 2010, and 2016 W. Holmes Road, from "A" one residential to "D-1" professional district, did not receive the required 6 votes therefor the Board does not recommend the petition be granted. The motion received four affirmative and two negative votes.

The Zoning Committee's recommendation to the Board on this petition was as follows:

That the petition be denied as filed, and that the property be rezoned from "A" one family to "C-2" family district. The Committee has found that the site is less than desirable for single family use, but could be replatted, developed and adequately served by the existing sewers if zoned "C-2" family residential.

There should be compelling reasons for any rezoning amendment and these reasons should be substantially related to the public welfare and necessity. The absence of neighborhood objection or the possibility of financial gain by the applicant are not sufficient reasons for a rezoning amendment. With these points in mind the following analysis is made:

The site is located on W. Holmes Road approximately 500 feet East of Pleasant Grove Road.

Land use in the area consists of commercial, professional and multiple family residential uses oriented to the intersection of Holmes and Pleasant Grove Roads. The New York Central Railroad runs north-easterly from a point on Holmes Road to Logan Street. There have been indications that a portion of this railroad may be vacated.

The Pleasant Grove elementary school is located on the northeast corner of Pleasant Grove and Holmes Road. The school presently occupies approximately 3.8 acres. The school Board has indicated that the site should be expanded.

The established land use pattern along the North side of Holmes Road is residential. This change would be contrary to that pattern.

The sewer capacities in this area, are extremely limited and due to the high storm water runoff created by professional office developments serious problems could result if this type of development were encouraged.

The change would excessively increase traffic congestion in close proximity to the school which could hasten the obsolescence of this facility at a great expense to the taxpayer.

There is vacant land in the immediate area zoned for this type of use.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Heino and Siebert—4.

Nays: Gaus and Reynolds—2.

Further discussion followed.

Z-27-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Edward C. Trowbridge, to rezone a parcel at 4526 South Logan Street, from "A" one family to "E-2" drive-in district be denied. The Committee further believes that this property and the adjacent properties should be considered for multiple dwelling at such time when overall development is possible.

The proposed change would be contrary to the Master Land Use Plan.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates integrated commercial centers throughout the City, and discourages strip commercial development along the major streets.

Strip commercial development along major streets detracts from planned commercial centers and reduces the traffic carrying capacities of those streets exposed to strip commercial development.

The change may adversely affect property values in the adjacent areas.

Indiscriminate change of zoning, lax enforcement on a misplaced zoning variance will create a land use pattern which will disrupt and erode away the character of

development that would enable a community to have a continuing sound tax base upon which to develop its revenue for the cost of services.

The change would be a deterrent to the improvement or development of adjacent property in accord with the existing regulations.

The known adverse influences of commercial uses on residential use such as dust, increased traffic, noise, activity, etc. would tend to discourage development and general improvement of the residential property to the west. This is especially true if commercial zoning and development is allowed to expand along Logan Street.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot continue to be used in accord with existing regulations.

The present zoning is "A" one family. The service station use is non-conforming and legal. This status was created upon annexation to the City of Lansing.

It is the policy of the Planning Board to discourage further strip commercial development along South Logan south of Pierce Road.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-37-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Lloyd Barnhart, to rezone a parcel at 3019 W. Miller Road, described as:

Comm. at the N. $\frac{1}{4}$ post of Section 7, T3N, R2W, thence S. 1250.4 ft., thence N. 66' 09" E. 196.8 ft. along the N. line of ramp B-1-36, thence N. 871.1 ft. thence S. 89° 50' W. 60 ft. to the Point of beg. City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family and "F" commercial to "H" light industry district be denied.

The change would be contrary to the Master Land Use Plan.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates residential development in this area.

The changes would deter the improvement or development of adjacent properties in accord with existing regulations.

The parcel under consideration would split the potential residential area, and

expose these areas to the adverse influences of industrial use.

The land should be platted in relationship to ultimate use.

There are no sewers or public utilities in the immediate area.

Coach Light Estates, containing more than 400 single family and multi-family homesites, has been approved to the northwest of this site.

In formulating the Master Land Use Plan, a special survey was made to find locations best suited to accommodate the future industrial demands of the community.

The following characteristics were considered in analysing potential sites:

Transportation — Accessibility by rail, highway, and air facilities.

Topography — Levelness, freedom from flooding, and adverse soil conditions.

Utilities and Services—Ease and economy of serving with utilities and services.

Effect on Surrounding Property—Absence of nuisance aspect or prospect of otherwise damaging adjacent property.

Location in Overall Plan — Suitability with respect to relative need for land for other uses.

Accessibility to Workers — Appropriately located as to be readily accessible to workers from residential areas.

Size of Site—Large enough to provide sufficient acreage for modern facilities and space for future expansion.

Industrial Park — Adaptable to development as planned industrial Park or district. (See Plate B) Master Plan.

Zoning is a tool to protect the community interest, as contrasted with individual interests.

The Planning Board considered the rezoning of this property February 23, 1965 and recommended denial, except for a small area 50 ft. square which permits the erection of an office building.

It was felt that the present use of the property should be discouraged, but that the temporary use of the land for the storage of equipment could be allowed, until the area is developed, at that time the use should be discontinued.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-39-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Joseph Mestelle, to rezone a parcel at the corner of W. Miller Road and Grovenburg Road, described as:

W. 231 ft. of the N. 565 ft. of N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ excluding N. 231 ft. of East 100 ft. Section 8, T3N, R2W

from "A" one residential to "D-1" professional district be denied.

Good zoning is not designed as a device to encourage development of any particular piece of property, but is intended to group similar uses and place them in the proper relationship to each other as well as the proper relationship as regards density of development, and accessibility by the using public.

Offices are basically as commercial use and as such should be restricted to, or on the periphery of, the commercial centers existing or as indicated on the Master Plan.

The abutting and adjacent land except as noted is residential in character. It is especially important in Lansing, at this particular time that efforts be made to protect and enhance existing residential sites from adverse spot zoning of a commercial nature.

The parcel is about two acres in size and should be platted in the interest of orderly growth in uniform lot sizes compatible with its present surroundings.

There are sites zoned and available for office development in the vicinity of Holmes and Logan, Jolly and Logan, Cedar at I-96, and Pennsylvania just North of Miller Road.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-40-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Kenneth Alden for Sun Oil Company, to rezone a parcel at 3017 S. Logan Street, from "A"

one family to "H" light industrial district, be denied as filed and the

East 10 ft. of the property
be zoned "J" parking and the
balance of the property
be zoned "E-2" drive-in shop district.

The change could adversely influence living conditions in the adjacent residential neighborhood to the East.

The proposed use for the site would allow and encourage full use of the land, which at the present time provides a green area to the East.

The proposed use could generate additional dust, smoke, and odor into the adjacent residential area.

The proposed change would be contrary to the Master Land Use Plan.

Zoning should be set up and used to assure that residential properties are protected against the encroachment of industrial uses.

The basic land use conditions have not changed in this area that would warrant the requested change to light industrial zoning.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with the appropriate zoning for the service station use.

There were no objections to the proposed amendment.

Mr. Black asked if the petitioner was aware of the proposed change recommended and if it suits the proposed use of the land? Mr. Guernsey replied that the petitioner is not aware of the recommendation and that the recommended "E-2" zoning would not permit the sale of boats and motors and their repair on the premises.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-41-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Miller-Davis Company, to rezone a parcel in the 900 and 1000 block of Platt Street, described as:

All of block 206 Original Plat City of Lansing, also Lots 1, 2, and 3 except the West 1 Rod thereof, and the

North 2 rods of East 6 rods Lot 4 all in Block 205 Original Plat, City of Lansing

from "D" apartment to Community Unit be denied.

There is no substantial reason why the property cannot be developed in accord with the existing zoning, and the associated height, density, and parking requirements.

The site is not within walking distance of a shopping center.

Increased traffic on Platt Street may become a nuisance to adjacent property owners and residents.

Filling of the flood plain would be necessary to keep the building out of potential flood damage.

Parking height, and density requirements are requested to be waived.

In a "D" apartment district the height limit is 90 feet, plus roof top appurtenances. For each 1 room apartment (efficiency) there must be a minimum of 700 square feet of lot area, and 950 square feet for each apartment with two or more rooms.

The applicant's request is for a waiver of $\pm 50,000$ square feet of the required lot area.

Three persons spoke in opposition of the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-42-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Dr. S. A. Belding, to rezone a parcel at 5325 S. Cedar Street, from "A" one family to "F" commercial district be denied as filed, and that

Lots 38 and 39

be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking and

Lots 40, 41, and 42

be rezoned from "A" one family to "F" commercial.

The change would not be contrary to the established Land Use Pattern.

Commercial zoning is prevalent in the immediate vicinity of the site.

The site is presently being used as a non-conforming commercial.

The present district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to existing conditions.

Commercial use and development of land in the vicinity has made it reasonable to assume that single family zoning is out of context with the existing zoning and land use development.

There are substantial reasons why the property cannot develop in accord with the existing zoning.

The adverse influences generated by the adjacent commercial use and the major street has made this less desirable for single family use.

There were no objections to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-43-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the petition to rezone property at 820 and 822 N. Chestnut and 426 W. Madison, from "C-2" family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be tabled for further study regarding the sewers in this area.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-44-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Merland and Laura Cornell, to rezone a parcel in the West of 2010 Ferrol described as:

West $\frac{1}{2}$ of Lot 11, Holloway's Sub-division

from "A" district to "D-M" district be denied.

The change would be contrary to the established Land Use Pattern.

The land along Ferrol Street is predominantly single family. There are two non-conforming duplex dwellings located several hundred feet west of the site.

There is an approved Community Unit Plan under construction directly North of this site. The density is limited to twelve dwelling units per acre.

The change would alter the population density pattern and thereby increase the load on public facilities.

The change would adversely influence living conditions in the area.

Under the "D-M" district regulations 13 units could be constructed on this which could conceivably generate 50 to 55 vehicle trips per day.

The change would deter the improvement and development of the adjacent properties in accord with the existing regulations.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with the existing zoning.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-46-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Land Investors Inc., to rezone a parcel North of and adjacent to 5030 S. Washington, described as:

Com. 25 feet west and 193 feet N. of S.E. corner Section 32, thence West 222 feet North 66 feet, E. 222 feet, S. to beg.;

from "A" residential to "B" residential district be denied.

The change would allow development contrary to the established land use pattern.

The land use development in the vicinity of the subject property is single family residential.

The change would create an isolated district, i.e. this would be a spot zone.

Zoning of properties in the vicinity is "A" one family residential.

The change could adversely influence living conditions in the area, principally through the increase of traffic and activity.

This is especially true if other property owners in the vicinity were given the same privilege.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot develop in accord with the existing zoning.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-48-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by John Bergeon, Branch Manager for Sinclair Refining Company, to rezone a parcel in the 1638 N. Grand River and 215 West North Street, described as:

Lots 27, 30, and 31 of the Frank L. Dodge Subdivision, City of Lansing, County of Ingham, State of Michigan

from "A" one family residential and "C-2" residential to "E-2" commercial district be denied as filed, and that the

Easterly 10 ft. of Lot No. 27 Dodge Subdivision

be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking, and the

balance of Lot No. 27

be rezoned from "A" one family to "E-2" drive-in shop,

The South 10 ft. of Lot No. 31

be rezoned from "C-2" family to "J" parking, and the

balance of Lot No. 31 and all of Lot No. 30

be rezoned from "C-2" family to "E-2" drive-in shop, all property being part of Frank L. Dodge Subdivision, City of Lansing.

The Committee further recommends that

Lots 28 and 29 of Frank L. Dodge Subdivision, City of Lansing,

be rezoned from "F" commercial to "E-2" drive-in shop.

The change would not be contrary to the established Land Use Pattern.

A portion of the site under consideration is being used for a service station.

Properties West, South, and North along Grand River Avenue are developed in a commercial nature.

The change would promote up-grading of the site, with screening for adjacent properties.

Due to the nature of the adjacent land use, it is reasonable to assume that the

property will not develop in accord with the existing zoning regulations.

The property is directly exposed to commercial development and major streets.

North Street is linked directly with Larch Street (U.S. 27 North) and carries high volumes of traffic. (approximately 10,000 vehicles per day).

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-49-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Mr. and Mrs. Ted Prawdzik, to rezone a parcel at 3131 W. Mt. Hope, from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied.

The Planning Board on April 4, 1967 gave approval to a preliminary plat of this parcel. The site does not have sufficient width to allow development on both sides of the proposed street.

Land use in the area consists of a school, park and single family homes immediately East of the site.

The Parks Department has indicated an interest in acquiring a portion of this site for additional park land.

Immediately West of this site are approximately 30 acres of vacant land. Ten acres are zoned "D-M" multiple dwelling and the balance which is adjacent to the site, is zoned "A" one family residential. If this request were granted it would isolate approximately 20 acres which would qualify for the same change. This would amount to approximately 40 acres zoned "D-M" multiple dwelling which could be developed with approximately 1160 apartment units.

This amount added to the 333 units already approved in the area would provide a total of 1493 dwelling units.

This is far in excess of the needs of the neighborhood and city.

There is considerable amount of vacant land in the city zoned for this type of use.

The change would be contrary to the established land use and the Master Plan.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

S-1-62F Meadow Wood Subdivision No. 2, Final Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that City Council be advised that the Final Plat of Meadow Wood Subdivision No. 2 has been returned to the Planning Board from the Register of Deeds office.

The Planning Board approved the plat on October 18, 1966. The City Council on October 31, 1966 also approved the Plat subject to the posting of financial security for the required public improvements. After receiving the estimated costs for the improvements, the developers found it necessary to obtain a loan. This in turn required an additional signature in the dedication. The date of the additional signature is out of sequence with the dates of Planning Board and City Council approval. This is contrary to the States Plat Act.

The Planning Board at their meeting on June 6, 1967 re-approved the plat of Meadow Wood Subdivision No. 2 and further recommended that the City Council re-approve the plat. This will allow the City Clerk to change the date on the plat and permit the plat to be recorded without further delay.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

S-15-63F-Marscot Meadows No. 3, Final Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that City Council be advised that the Planning Board approved the final plat of Marscot Meadows No. 3 and recommend that it be approved by City Council subject to the following conditions:

All public improvements shall be installed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewers, storm sewers and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks and such other improvements as required under Section VI D of Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

The posting of financial security, as outlined in Section VI B Lansing Subdivision Regulations in the amount of:

Sidewalk	\$ 18,300
Curb and Gutter	12,200
Monuments	460
Gravel	9,500
Storm Sewer	34,000
Sanitary Sewer	42,000
Total	\$116,460

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Act of 1929 as amended shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

S-3-67P Penn Industrial Park, Preliminary Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the developer Lansing Christian School Association, be notified that the preliminary plat of Penn Industrial Park was approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Final plat should be developed with all public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and the Lansing Subdivision Regulations.
2. Construction and improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior to approval of the final plat.
3. All required easements should be recorded on the face of the Final Plat.
4. Street right-of-way should be 66 feet with 36 foot pavement. The radius of the cul-de-sac should be a minimum of 75 feet.
5. A plat restriction prohibiting direct access from Lots 1 and 9 to Pennsylvania Avenue should appear on the face of the Final Plat.
6. The easements for utility outlets from the Consumers Power Company and the owners of Midway Industrial Park be acquired.
7. This approval shall expire June 6, 1968.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

S-4-67P Marscot Meadows No. 2,
Preliminary Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the developer William J. Warner, be notified that the preliminary plat of Marscot Meadows No. 2 was approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Final plat to be developed with complete improvements including water, storm and sanitary sewer, and full street improvements including street paving, curb, gutter, and sidewalks and any other improvements as may be required by the City or other agents.
2. That all lots be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.
3. The posting of financial security in the amount as determined by the Public Service Department, prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.
4. All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Acts of 1929, as amended, shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

S-4-67F Marscot Meadows No. 2 Final Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black that City Council be advised that the Planning Board approved the final plat of Marscot Meadows No. 2, and recommend that it be approved by City Council subject to the following conditions:

All public improvements shall be installed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewers, storm sewers and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks and such other improvements as required under Section VI D of Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

The posting of financial security, as outlined in Section VI B Lansing Subdivision Regulations in the amount of:

Sidewalks	\$10,500
Curb and Gutter	7,000
Monuments	500
Gravel	5,000
Storm Sewer	18,700
Sanitary Sewer	12,500
Total	\$54,200

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Act of 1929 as amended shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

S-12-65P Delta River Drive Estates No. 2,
Preliminary Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the developer Leon Schneberger, be notified that the preliminary plat of Delta River Drive Estates No. 2 was approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Final Plat should be developed with all public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and the Lansing Subdivision Regulations.
2. Construction and improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior to the approval of the Final Plat.
3. All required easements should be recorded on the face of the final plat.
4. The Haze drain right-of-way 10 feet each side of the centerline should be shown on the face of the final plat.
5. A right-of-way dedication of 50 ft. from the centerline of Delta River Drive should be provided.
6. All lots should be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.
7. This approval shall expire June 6, 1968.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

ROW-4-67

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Siebert, that City Council be advised that the Planning Board considered the vacation of two unimproved stub streets extending to the North and East of the I-96 R.O.W. Secor Street extends westerly from the I-96 R.O.W., has a length along the southerly R.O.W. line of 300 feet and a width of 50 feet. Floyd Street extends 150 feet north from I-96 and has a 50 foot width. The Planning Board has approved a plat, Marscot Meadows No. 3 for the area that abuts Secor Street on the west.

The Planning Department requested recommendation on the proposed vacation from interested City Departments and Public Utilities. There was no objections to the proposed vacations.

Mr. Soderburg, owner of Lot 25, was present at the Planning Board meeting and stated that he thought Secor Street, having once been used to move farm machinery, should not be vacated. He further stated that vacating would not have any effect on his lot which has been landlocked since construction of Highway 1-96. There was no one present representing Mr. Skory.

Discussion followed.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yeas: Gaus, Heino and Siebert—3.

Nays: Black, Bretz and Reynolds—3.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Heino, that the minutes of April 4, 1967 and April 18, 1967 be approved.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

SS-12-67

Public hearing on the proposed amendment to Chapter 36 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Lansing, in regard to the "E-2" district be set for August 18, 1967 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1 Sixth Floor, City Hall.

Z-69-67

Public hearing on the petition by Francis Fine, for the rezoning of a parcel in the 3100-3200 blocks of Turner Street, from "A" one family to Community Unit Plan was set for July 11, 1967 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1, Sixth Floor, City Hall.

Z-70-67

Public hearing on the petition by Francis Fine, for the rezoning of a parcel in the 3000 through 3500 block of Waverly Road, from "A" one family to Community Unit Plan, was set for July 11, 1967 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1, Sixth Floor, City Hall.

July Meeting of the Planning Board:

Since the first Tuesday in July falls on July 4th, Independence Day, the Planning Board unanimously decided to hold the first

regular meeting of the month of July on July 11, 1967 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1, Sixth Floor, City Hall.

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Reynolds, that the request by John Schell, for a change in the screening for the Simken Village Community Unit Plan be approved.

The Board approved the following types of screening by unanimous vote:

A 5 ft. 6 in. cedar or redwood stockade fence.

A 5 ft. 6 in. cedar or redwood basket weave fence.

The Board further stipulated that the fence touch or clear by a narrow distance the ground to prevent debris from blowing under the fence.

FINANCE COMMITTEE

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Department receive a check from the Housing Commission in the amount of \$783.27 and deposit it to the account No. 170122, a part time help.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that Mr. Guernsey be authorized to attend a Mass Transit Conference in Kent, Ohio.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Guernsey read the letter from the Fire Chief relative to the extension of Holmes Road which was then circulated to the Board members. Matter was referred to the Master Plan Study for the southeast area of the City.

Meeting adjourned at 12:20 A.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

T/C

Engineer Rolland Case, a member of the Local 421 Mediation Board, addressed the Board in regards to the method of handling department grievances. Chairman Buhl informed Engineer Case that grievances would be handled by the Personnel Committee as soon as Commissioner Wolfram returned from his vacation.

Chief Space requested permission from the Board to attend the International Fire Chief's Conference in San Francisco.

By Commissioner Hill—

That the Chief be granted permission to attend the Fire Chief's Conference.

Supported by Commissioner Doyle.

Carried.

By Commissioner Doyle—

I move we adjourn.

Supported by Commissioner Sheathelm.

Carried.

The Board adjourned at 8:10 P.M.

HAROLD F. GLUMM,
Acting Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, June 20, 1967

Meeting called to order by Vice Chairman Kenneth Black at 7:35 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz and Reynolds—6.

Absent: Heino and Siebert—2.

HEARINGS

SS-4-67 Proposed Flood Plain Control Regulations:

Mr. James Church, member of the Staff, discussed the proposed flood plain control ordinance, in regard to the definition, designated boundaries, certain uses allowed within those boundaries, uses allowed by special permit under conditions, the U. S. Corps of Engineers determination of the 1947 flood plain, and the additional studies now being made.

Copies of the tentative text outline of the flood plain control were passed out to those people present in the audience.

Mr. Leo Farhat, attorney representing Foresburg and Gibbons, asked questions regarding the following:

Developments recently completed within the designated flood plain;

What impact the filling will have in the contour of the flood plain;

The qualifications of those involved in the technical drafting of the proposed flood plain regulations;

The amount of encroachment on the flood plain;

The exceptions to the dumping or back filling requirement;

Prevention of increasing the flood area;

Standards by which prohibited uses would be permitted within the flood way;

The fair and equal treatment of all the property owners on the river;

The possibility of another public hearing.

Mr. Rolland Stebbins, Chairman of the River Improvement Committee, commented on their last meeting at which they were unanimous in recommending to the City of Lansing and the townships of Meridian, Lansing, Delhi, and Delta that they adopt a river flood plain ordinance.

Joan Brigham, a member of the Nature-way Association Board of Directors, stated

that this organization supports the flood plain ordinance.

Mr. Eric Kauma, attorney member of the Mayor's River Improvement Committee, stated that they have compared the proposed ordinance with the ordinance in Meridian Township, and it compares favorably, if not better. A step should be taken now to preserve the flood plain and to prevent problems in the future.

Lawrence Mahon, 300 S. Howard Street, Lansing Township, commented in regard to the 1947 flood and the dikes and pumps in the river. He stated he was opposed to the proposed ordinance as it stands for Lansing Township.

Richard Neller, on behalf of the Home Builders Association, stated that they feel that this type of control is certainly necessary. Not sure that the suggested form is the best, but look forward to working with people to come up with an ordinance that would be the best possible. This is a very complex problem and the Home Builders Association does have an interest, as do many of its individual members. We do feel something should be done, but would like to study it and make our contributions after it has received a little more attention.

F. G. Butler, engineer at Oldsmobile, and a member of the River Improvement Committee, and a member of the Michigan Grand River Watershed Council, introduced Mr. Dale Granger, of the Water Resources Commission.

Dale Granger, stated that the Water Resources Commission, of the State of Michigan is charged with the responsibility of coordinating flood plain information studies that are requested by local governmental agencies with the Army Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army. Our agency has coordinated applications for over 350 miles of stream systems in the State of Michigan and have processed today for an additional stream miles in urbanized areas in the State of Michigan where there is a need for flood plain studies to be completed. There is ample reason to adopt a flood plain ordinance. Mr. Granger went on to verify the need for flood plain controls.

Senate Bill 222 is about to become a law in the State of Michigan, which would require that all land is to be subdivided, must be submitted to the Water Resources Commission of the State of Michigan if it bounds on banks of a stream or the shores of a lake for review. The Commission must delineate the flood plain of that property and the development of the property must be consistent with good land use practices within a flood plain zone. No federal agency may loan any money or become involved in any grant program for construction of any kind of facility, public or private, that will be constructed in a flood plain of a river. This is an executive order issued within the last 12 months.

Mr. Manz, Board member, who was Director of Public Service and City Engineer at the time of the 1947 flood commented in regard to high water since then and also to dikes, on which he believes too much emphasis is placed.

Matter was referred to the Ordinance Committee.

Mrs. Bretz, Chairman, arrived at 8:30 P.M.

ROW-5-67

Mr. George Covert, appeared in regard to ROW-5-67, a request to vacate a portion of an east-west alley between Bradley and Osband in the block south of Moores River Drive.

Mr. Covert stated that this alley has been a nuisance and that the people in the neighborhood are fearful of minor and major crimes because of access of the alley. The portion requested to be vacated is 66 feet.

No objections were made to this request.

Referred to the Streets Committee.

Recess from 8:40 to 9:07.

BUSINESS SESSION

RE: Z-142-67

The Planning Board had been asked by City Council to reconsider the zoning in the entire block bounded by Washington, Madison, Grand and Saginaw in view of Urban Renewal Project No. 2 and new construction in this particular area.

Motion by Fink, supported by Black, that the Planning Board advise City Council that they have reviewed the present zoning in the area bounded by Washington, Madison, Grand, and Saginaw in accordance with Council's request.

The Planning Board find that the zoning is proper and in the best interest of the future development of the city. More intense commercial and, or business zoning could, by massive buildings and permitted uses, permit development which would conflict with reasonable movement of traffic; could cause or permit the erection of buildings to heights which would be out of character for the surrounding area; permit functions to be carried on which would detract from and run counter to the comprehensive plan for redevelopment of the Central City.

The character of this area as it is now developing with low offices, residential structures, and the Lansing Community

College, is found to be reasonable and in the best interests of the city.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Fink, Manz and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

SS-14-67 South Logan Street Zoning Policy

Mr. Edwin P. Brown, Assistant Planning Director, spoke in regard to the proposed policy. He pointed out that this area (along S. Logan Street from Jolly Road south to the I-96 freeway system) was annexed to the City of Lansing June 28, 1964. Upon annexation the area was zoned "A" one family in accordance with Section 36-5 of the Zoning Ordinance. In this particular study area, many of the uses developed without sound zoning controls, and violate the City Zoning Regulations in many aspects. Mr. Brown proceeded to outline the three parts of the proposed policy and the implementation to each part.

Mr. Fink commented in regard to curb cuts and ingress and egress in the blocks in the area in question. He recommended that the Staff in working on this proposal consider the density of land developed along this major trunkline to be able to maintain residential characteristics of the area and to be prepared to meet the future growth demands.

Mr. Guernsey replied that this factor is being considered at the present time in the Regional Land Use-Transportation Study.

Mr. Black asked what the width of pavement in the subject area as compared to the pavement on Cedar Street and asked if there was indication from the Highway Department or the Public Service Department that the proposed Logan boulevard might eventually extend to the Interchange?

Mr. Brown replied that the widening was being done up to Victor Avenue. There are five lanes of 12 ft. width each.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

STREET COMMITTEE

ROW-5-67

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the City Council be advised that the Planning Board at their meeting of June 20, 1967 considered the request to vacate a portion of an E.-W. alley between Bradley and Osband in the block south of Moores River Drive.

The following information was submitted:

The portion of the alley requested for vacation has a width of 16.5 ft. and a length of 66 ft. and abuts Lots No. 1 and 8 of Block 6 of Park Place Addition.

The petition to vacate is signed by the abutting property owners located on the west side of Bradley Avenue.

The portion of the alley under consideration has not been improved nor has it been extended to connect with Bradley Avenue. It has been improved and is used west of this requested vacation to Osband Avenue.

Bradley Avenue between Moores River Drive and Barnes has a R.O.W. of 148.5 ft. the westerly 90 ft. being maintained by the Parks Department as a green area.

This alley is part of an east-west alley pattern between Moores River Drive and Barnes Avenue which extends from Beal avenue to a north-south alley which runs behind the frontage lots on the west side of South Washington Avenue.

The Traffic Engineer states, "There is no good reason why this alley should be vacated as it might be necessary to use this alley right-of-way in the future."

Although the easterly 160 ft. of the alley between Osband and Bradley has not been improved it is used as a pedestrian walk through to the improved portion of the alley. It is difficult to accurately estimate the long range use of this land, but it is reasonable to assume that the residential density of this area will increase in the future. The vacation of this portion of the alley would negate its future development and use as part of the established alley pattern of this section of the city, for this reason the Planning Board recommends that the requested vacation be denied.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

S-5-67P Four Seasons Subdivision-Preliminary Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the Preliminary Plat of Four Seasons Subdivisions be approved subject to the following conditions:

Final Plat to be redeveloped with public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

Construction and improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior to the approval of the final plat.

All required easements should be shown on the face of the final plat.

Street rights-of-way should be 66 feet on York Road and Lewton Place and 90 feet on the boulevard entrance from Moores River Drive. A 48 foot dedication for Moores River Drive should be included on the face of the plat.

Pavement widths should be 36 feet on York Road and Lewton Place and 24 feet on each lane of the boulevard entrance.

A plat restriction prohibiting direct access from lots one, two and four to Moores River Drive should appear on the face of the final plat.

Outlot A should be reduced to two feet in depth.

All lots should be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.

This approval shall expire June 20, 1968.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

S-6-67P RND Industrial Park, Preliminary Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the Preliminary Plat of RND Industrial Park be approved subject to the following conditions:

Final Plat to be developed with public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

Construction and improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior to the approval of the final plat.

All required easements should be recorded on the face of the final plat.

Street right-of-way should be 66 feet with a 36 foot pavement.

All lots should be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.

This approval shall expire June 20, 1968.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

S-7-67P Penn-Cedar Subdivision, Preliminary Plat:

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the Preliminary Plat of Penn-Cedar Subdivision be approved subject to the following conditions:

Final Plat to be developed with public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

Construction and improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior to the approval of the final plat.

All required easements should be recorded on the face of the final plat.

Street right-of-way should be 66 feet with a 36 foot pavement. A temporary turn around should be constructed at the northern end of the proposed street.

All lots shall be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.

This approval shall expire June 20, 1968.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Manz and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

S-8-67P Duncel Interchange Subdivision

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Manz, that the Preliminary Plat of Duncel Interchange Subdivision be approved subject to the following conditions:

Final Plat to be developed with public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

Construction and improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior to the approval of the final plat.

All required easements should be submitted and approved prior to the approval of the final plat.

All lots should be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.

This approval shall expire June 20, 1968.

SS-12-67

Motion by Black, seconded by Manz, that the Planning Board recommend that the City Council set a public hearing date at which time the Planning Board would consider an amendment to Chapter 36 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Lansing.

The present Zoning Code in Section 36-4.1 "E-2" district, refers to a gas station as

an allowable use. The definition section of the Code does not have a definition for a gas station, but has one for a "filling station" which, due to its broad interpretation, allows other uses not intended by the Ordinance. It is the opinion of the City Attorney that the Zoning Ordinance with respect to gas stations, stands in need of substantial clarification.

In order to clarify the Zoning Code, the following is proposed:

1. Under Section 36-1 Definitions-delete (17) filling stations.
2. Under Section 36-1 Definitions-add the following definition:

Auto Service Station: is a place where gasoline, or any other automobile engine fuel (stored only in underground tanks), kerosene or motor oil and lubricants or grease (for operation of motor vehicles), are retailed directly to the public on the premises; including the sale of minor automotive accessories and the servicing of and minor repair of automobiles. As used in this definition, repairs, ordinarily considered as minor repairs to automobiles, and not including (1) major repairs (such as engine, transmission and/or differential rebuilding) or (2) collision service (such as body, frame or fender straightening, and repair), or (3) overall painting; and "automotive accessories" are those accessories necessary or useful to this care and operation of a motor vehicle.

3. Under Section 36-34.1 "E-2" districts permitted uses. Change paragraph (2) from: (2) gas stations to (2) auto service stations.

The Planning Board suggested that the required public hearing be set for the Board by City Council for Tuesday, August

15, 1967 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1, Sixth Floor, City Hall.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Community Centers William D. Bechtel, planner, distributed booklets to the Board which provided information in regard to Lansing's experience with the community centers program up to this time. He proceeded to discuss the background, site selection, requirements for federal aid grant program, and what other cities have done in regard to Community Centers.

MASTER PLAN REVISION—FOREST VIEW COMMUNITY

SS-1-67

William D. Bechtel, Planner, brought the Board up to date in regard to the Forest View Community Master Plan Revision, discussing the proposed study in the Forest View area, involving population forecast, utility capacities, design in the area, and projected community facilities.

Discussion followed.

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that a resolution of appreciation be passed commending Mr. Manz for his able and conscientious service in his years on the Planning Board.

Mr. Guernsey expressed the appreciation and thanks of the Planning Department and Staff to Mr. Manz for his council and help.

Meeting adjourned at 10:50 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, July 18, 1967

Meeting called to order by Chairman Ramona Bretz at 7:37 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Absent: Duncan and Heino—2.

HEARINGS

Re: Z-11-67

On May 16, 1967 the City Council referred the subject petition to rezone property at 403 N. Sycamore Street and 712 W. Shiawassee Street, from "D-M" multiple dwelling district to "D-1" professional office district, back to the Committee on Planning and the Planning Board for re-consideration.

Dr. June, the petitioner of Z-11-67 was present and stated his reasons for desiring to stay downtown. He stated that his need is urgent and any consideration of the Board would be greatly appreciated.

Mr. Reynolds asked if Dr. June planned to use the same buildings that are on the property now, and Dr. June replied that it is his plan for the time being to use both and when remodeling can be completed, then the smaller of the two buildings would be torn down for additional parking.

Mr. Brown, assistant planning director, asked Dr. June to explain the urgency of the situation. Dr. June replied that since he must get more space, he would have to go out of downtown, and that he has an option on a piece of property on Waverly Road. He does not want to go out of downtown but would like to have a decision on the pending zoning before the option expires.

Mr. Gaus asked how many people were in the doctor's practice, and Dr. June replied his partner and himself. He went on to explain his present space conditions.

Mr. Reynolds asked how close this property is to any other "D-1" professional office zoning in the area, and Dr. June replied a half block to the east.

Mr. Fink asked how many parking spaces would be available on the proposed site, and Dr. June replied he thought there would be about fifteen parking places before the building was torn down.

Further discussion followed.

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the rules be suspended to reconsider Z-11-67.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the petition Z-11-67 be referred to the Zoning Committee for report at the next regular meeting of the Planning Board.

Mr. Gaus asked Mr. Brown to point out where there is "D-1" professional zoning in the downtown area. Mr. Brown proceeded to discuss the proposed "D-1" professional zoning in the Central City Plan. The area in which the proposed rezoning is located is designated for apartments.

Mr. Reynolds suggested that the Staff take another look in regard to expanding the "D-1" professional district in the downtown area, since if this parcel was rezoned, it would be a spot zoning and there would no doubt be more requests for the same type of rezoning.

Further discussion followed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Mr. Brooks, representing neighbors, in the Ionia-Shiawassee street area, stated a petition has been previously filed in op-

position to this proposed rezoning. He commented in regard to spot zoning.

Mr. Fink recommended that this petition be made available to the Zoning Committee and the Planning Staff.

COMMUNITY SHELTER PLAN

Mr. Brown introduced Mr. William Rowden, Assistant Director, of the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission, who discussed the Community Shelter Plan, which will update a pilot shelter plan done for the federal government in 1965. The ultimate product of the local shelter program will be a map showing the residents the buildings near their homes or places of employment that are licensed shelters, and which one they should go to in a nuclear disaster.

Discussion followed.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus, that contract be entered into with Tri-County Regional Planning Commission to provide services necessary to develop a Community Shelter Plan, and recommends that Council take whatever action necessary to formalize this contract.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Recess from 8:47 to 9:05 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

The following committees were appointed at the July 18, 1967 regular meeting of the Planning Board to serve from July 1, 1967 to June 30, 1968.

Executive Committee

Ramona J. Bretz, Chairman
Kenneth C. Black
Russell H. Fink

Urban Renewal and Housing Sites

Lloyd S. Reynolds, Chairman
Kenneth C. Black
Russell H. Fink
Richard E. Gaus

Zoning Committee

Roland H. Siebert, Chairman
Russell H. Fink
Fred Heino
Ramona J. Bretz

Ordinance

Kenneth C. Black, Chairman
Rolland H. Siebert
Ramona J. Bretz

Streets and Subdivisions

Richard E. Gaus, Chairman
David Duncan
Kenneth C. Black

Capital Improvements

Fred Heino, Chairman
Lloyd S. Reynolds
David Duncan

Buildings and Properties

David Duncan, Chairman
Lloyd S. Reynolds
Fred Heino

Finance

Russell H. Fink, Chairman
Richard E. Gaus
Rolland Siebert

SS-4-67 Flood Plain Control

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that setting hearing date be postponed until an opinion from the City Attorney is forthcoming as to whether another hearing on this matter is legally required.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

SS-14-67 South Logan Street Zoning Policy

Mr. Brown reiterated the purpose of the South Logan Street Zoning Policy, stating that this study had been requested by Council due to the many requests for rezoning in this area. He pointed out the existing uses and the proposed uses for the subject area.

Mr. Fink asked what is suggested for a reasonable setback for commercial developments.

Mr. Brown replied that the implementation of Policy Part 1 recommends that the parcels requesting "F" commercial be zoned with a forty foot "J" parking area abutting the right-of-way line. Some buildings would thus become non-conforming and in time would have to be replaced.

Mr. Reynolds asked if this 40 ft. setback would allow a service road plus parking. Mr. Brown replied that it was felt this would allow one line of 90° parking plus a two-way service road.

Discussion followed in regard to phasing out those existing businesses that do not qualify as neighborhood serving uses or are not now part of a planned unit as proposed in Policy Part II.

Councilman Joel Ferguson commented in regard to visual impact of the private low income homes along this area.

Mr. Brown stated that it is hoped that land would be platted and the homes would rear onto Logan Street, with screening provided.

Councilman Lou Adado recommended that something be done from the roadway right to the property line in regard to homes rearing the street. He suggested that the developer, if sidewalks are desirable in that area, go in prior to construction or before selling of the property so that the developer can pass this on as part of his costs. When a developer comes in for plating where they don't want the front of the properties facing a major roadway, it should be required that sidewalks or some kind of buffer be part of the plating procedure.

Further discussion followed.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Black, that the South Logan Street Zoning Policy (SS-14-67) be referred to the Zoning Committee for report and recommendation at the next regular Planning Board meeting.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-19-67

Motion by Fink, seconded by Reynolds, that Z-19-67 be placed on the next regular agenda of the Planning Board for their August 1, 1967 meeting and in the meantime be referred to the Zoning Committee and that the applicant be notified that the subject rezoning will be reviewed at this time.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

ROW-7-67

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council, after considering the request of Edgar Loring, for closing of a driveway at

805 W. Kalamazoo Street, that the driveway be closed if legally possible.

The driveway requested to be closed is located on the south side of West Kalamazoo Street between South Butler and South Sycamore Street. The driveway serves a parking area for two apartment buildings, (a 17 unit and a 30 unit) located on W. Lenawee Street. In that the driveway parking area extends between W. Kalamazoo and W. Lenawee Streets it is used as a throughway between the two. The petitioner also states that it is used as a lovers lane, a speedway, a collector of debris and is dangerous to children that play in the area.

The closing of the driveway on W. Kalamazoo would eliminate the using of this as a throughway and would restrict all traffic generated by the apartments to W. Lenawee Street. Raised stripes in the pavement would reduce the speed of vehicles using this area but would not be a complete solution.

The City Attorney has been requested to give an opinion as to the legal right of the city to close a driveway.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

ROW-9-67

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the Planning Board at their meeting of July 18, 1967 approved the referral by City Council to vacate an interior section of an alley (198 ft. x 12 ft.) extending between Ottawa Street and Ionia Street in the 200 block of N. Washington Avenue.

The Michigan Bell Telephone Company has submitted a proposal for Parcel No. 9 Urban Renewal Project No. 1. The parcel consists of 198 ft. of frontage by 153 ft. of depth, and is located in the 200 block of North Washington Avenue between the present Tussing Building and the Gladmer Theatre.

The Michigan Bell Telephone states that the alley vacation is needed in order for them to extend their mechanical operation existing in the present Bell Telephone building on Capitol Avenue to the proposed building on Parcel No. 9, fronting on North Washington Avenue. This extension has to be accomplished on the same level in a straight line from the existing installation.

Provisions will have to be made for the existing utilities in the portion of the alley requested for vacation and for the 66 ft. of alley which abuts the Michigan Mutual Building, which is owned by the Davenport Institute.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

S-11-66F

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the final plat of Ravenswood Heights, be approved subject to the following conditions:

The subdivision shall be improved with complete public utilities, including water, sanitary sewer, storm sewer, and full street improvements, including paving, curbs and gutter and sidewalks.

Approval of the final plat by the charter township of Lansing.

The posting of financial security in the amount of:

Curb and Gutter	\$ 7,832.00
Monuments	560.00
Bituminous	2,270.00
Gravel	5,720.00
Total	\$15,882.00

Acceptance of the deed for outlot F by the City Council.

All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Acts of 1929, as amended shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

SS-12-65 Zoning Filing Fee

Motion by Black, seconded by Siebert, to request City Council to give immediate attention to the Planning Board's previous recommendation on that a filing fee of \$50.00 be established.

Mr. Fink commented in regard to a sliding scale fee as opposed to a set fee for all rezoning applications. He questioned if it is realistic to assume that a \$50.00 fee would cover all zoning applications.

Mr. Black stated it had been discussed that there be exceptions made where property is automatically reverted to "A" one family upon annexation to the City.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Mr. Fink stipulated that his vote was not necessarily for a \$50.00 fee, but that some action be taken in regard to the Zoning filing fee.

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

M/C

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, July 11, 1967

Meeting called to order at 7:45 P.M. by
Chairman Ramona Bretz.

HEARINGS

Z-70-67

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Fink, Siebert,
Gaus, Duncan and Reynolds—7.

Absent: Heino—1.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The chair was turned over to the Secretary for the annual election of officers.

The floor was opened to nominations for Chairman.

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that Mrs. Ramona J. Bretz be nominated for the office of Chairman and that the nominations be closed and an unanimous ballot be cast for Mrs. Bretz.

Motion carried unanimously.

The floor was then opened to nominations for Vice Chairman.

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Siebert, that Mr. Kenneth C. Black be nominated for the office of Vice Chairman and that the nominations be closed and a unanimous ballot be cast for Mr. Black.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Reynolds that Raymond C. Guernsey be retained as Secretary of the Planning Board.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mrs. Bretz assumed the chair.

Mr. Francis Fine, developer, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone the property at the 3000, 3500 blocks of Waverly Road from "A" one family to Community Unit district.

Mr. William Bechtel, Planner, discussed the purposes and objectives. He then discussed the location, street relocation to the site, and land use in the area of the proposed Community Unit Plan.

Mr. Fine discussed the background of this proposal. He then introduced architects Mr. George Fonville and Mr. Mike Thomas. They proceeded with a slide presentation and discussion of the proposed development.

Mr. Black asked the difference between the units described as regular family units and housing for the elderly. Mr. Fine replied that the size and floor plan is different but from a design standpoint, they are intended to blend together.

Mr. Siebert commented that there seemed to be only one exit onto Waverly Road.

Mr. Black commented that in both cases of housing for the elderly there seems to be a number of units that are quite remote from where these people would park their cars, and that they would have quite a walk from the car to the housing units.

Mr. Allan Stebbins, President of the Lansing Homebuilders Association, read to the Board a resolution in support of low income housing.

Mr. Carl Godding, attorney with law firm of Snyder, Loomis and Ewert, stated that this firm represents some 400 families in the northwest area, whose interest in the matter is that the area be used and developed in the best possible interest and purpose for all concerned.

Mr. Andy Leitz, 3019 Arcadia Drive, questioned the proposed development in regard to: the possible poor attitude of area residents because of inadequate information in regard to the proposed de-

velopment; the safety of children because of additional traffic generated by the development; if the school and the sewer capacity is great enough to handle the increased density, and how this project will accomplish the purpose of low income housing.

Mr. Charles Woodruff, 3708 Delta River Drive, expressed his concern in regard to adjacent property values because of the proposed development.

Reverend John Howell, 1515 W. Washenaw, spoke in regard to the need for public housing in the City of Lansing. Stating that the proposal presented seemed to have unusual merit; also in regard to the question that was raised as to whether people in the proposed unit would be accepted.

Reverend George Grettenberger, 1011 Dakin Street, Chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the Capitol Area Economic Opportunity Committee, presented a resolution to the Board in support of public housing, and urging the Board to take whatever rezoning action necessary to bring this program to a successful conclusion.

Mr. Wade Saleska, 8008 Arcadia Drive, stated his concern as to maintenance of the proposed development, and the assessment of property values in the area.

Mr. Marcel Elliott, acting Director of the Housing Commission, spoke in response to questions raised in regard to the proposed development, adding that a compatible relationship between those in the housing units and the surrounding residents is desirable.

Mr. Don Hareski, of the Housing Commission, spoke in regard to sewers in the area to serve this project, stating that there would be no problem in this regard.

Mr. Ben Cannady, Director of the Housing Committee of the Inter-Faith Council, spoke in support of the proposed development, and also in regard to the residents of the low cost housing being accepted in the churches.

Further discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-69-67

Mr. Francis Fine, developer, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone the property at 3100-3200 Turner Street, from "A" one family to Community Unit.

Mr. William Bechtel, planner, discussed the proposed development in regard to size, land use in the vicinity, and the layout of the proposed development.

The architect for the proposed development presented slides showing the configuration of the property and the physical layout of the proposal.

Mrs. Ambrose, 3224 Turner Street, objected to the proposal.

Marjory Bock, 3222 Christine Drive, representing the League of Women Voters of the Lansing area, spoke in support of public housing at the proposed site and urged its approval.

George Quimby, 219 W. Fairfield, spoke in objection to the proposed amendment.

Robert Nevue, 3207 Turner Street, presented to the Board a petition in opposition to the proposed development signed by approximately 24 residents.

Received and placed on file.

Mr. Marcel Elliott, acting director of the Housing Commission, spoke in defense of low income people.

A letter from the Greater Lansing Council AFL-CIO in support of the proposed development was read by Mr. Guernsey. Received and placed on file.

A letter from the Greater Lansing Urban League in support of the proposed development was read by Mr. Guernsey.

Received and placed on file.

Further discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

S9-67P Southland Plaza, Preliminary Plat

Mr. E. P. Brown discussed the location, surrounding land use, and proposed plans for the development.

Mr. Alan Ginsberg, developer of the proposed plat, discussed the plans for the development.

Mr. Reynolds questioned the parking for the proposed commercial uses. Mr. Ginsberg replied that each lot would be designed as a self contained building with its own parking area around it.

Councilman Frank Perrin asked if there had been any intention to ask for any other use for the area proposed to be parking and Mr. Ginsberg replied that there had not.

Mr. Perrin further commented in regard to the fact that in some shopping centers the outer perimeter of parking is at a fair distance from the commercial use itself and

is unsightly and not maintained. He asked if perhaps 20 ft. of the outer parking area along the main streets could be retained as a green area, and Mr. Ginsberg replied that they are donating to the City on the Holmes-Washington Avenue side of the subject property a 27 ft. right-of-way for future highway widening and this could be a planted green area if desirable.

Mr. Gaus asked who would be operating the two proposed gas stations on the subject site? Mr. Ginsberg replied that one would be purchased by Shell Oil Company and the other is under option to Sun Oil Company.

Further discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

Z-79-67

Ann Elrod, petitioner, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone the property at 1027 Seymour Street, from "C-2" family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Mrs. Elrod presented pictures of the present building on the site to the Board and explained that she proposed four bachelor apartments.

Mr. Fink commented that the requirement for this number of units would be six. Mrs. Elrod stated that she was not aware of this so Mr. Fink suggested she contact the Planning Staff in regards to this situation.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-80-67

Mrs. Betty Brennan appeared in regard to the petition, to rezone property at 2801 N. East Street, from "C-2" family to "F" commercial district.

Mrs. Brennan stated that she wishes to sell the property as commercial, since she does not feel there is any residential sale value because of the commercial use in the area.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-81-67

Mrs. Bonita Wenzl, petitioner appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property

at 2805 N. East Street, from "C-2" family to "F" commercial district.

Mrs. Wenzl commented in regard to the commercial establishments in the area, stating that the area is not suited for residential, and that she wants to sell the property since she intends to leave the City.

Mr. Carl Kessler, of Weaver-Kessler Realty appeared in favor of the proposed amendment.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-82-67

Mr. Donald Hines, attorney representing General Motors, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone the property at the S.W. corner of Olds and Birch, from C, F, B, D, J, H to "I" heavy industry.

Mr. Hines approached the Board with a diagram of the Oldsmobile main plan facilities along with the view of where they have parking facilities. He stated that all of the property in the request for rezoning was in the industrial area proposed by the Master Plan, and that Oldsmobile needs the property for expansion purposes.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-83-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 2221 E. Kalamazoo Street, from "B-1" family to "F" commercial.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-84-67

Mr. Jack Nichols, real estate representative of Mobile Oil Company, appeared in regard to the petition at 1301, 1305, 1309, 1311 W. Main Street, from "B-1" family to "E-2" drive-in district.

Mr. Nichols presented to the Board three plot plans showing layout and artists conception of the type of service station that is proposed to be developed on the subject site.

Mr. Black asked if the proposed Birch Street and Logan Street throughway system in this area contemplates the widening

of Birch Street and if so, is any allowance made for it in this plant? Mr. Nichols replied that this had been checked and that 30 ft. would be taken off the east side of Birch.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-85-67

Mr. Hugh Dyer, 1920 N. Larch Street, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 602 Woodbury Avenue, from "C-2" family to "F" commercial district.

Mr. Dyer stated that the State Highway is taking half of his buildings so he has purchased two lots straight east, and wishes to use the first lot as commercial property to rebuild his store and then move the original building back 40 feet to the east. This is a grocery store.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-86-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone the property at 3238 W. Holmes Road, from "A-1" family to "C-2" family district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-87-67

Mr. LeGrand appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at LeGrand Avenue from "A-1" and "D-M" districts to "C-2" and "D-M" districts.

Mr. LeGrand stated he thought the proposed zoning would make the property more compatible to the surrounding area. Plans to build bi-level office building of colonial design.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-88-67

Mr. Harold Davis appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 3301 E.

Michigan Avenue, from "J" and "D-M" to "J" and "F" district.

Mr. Davis stated that this petition has been filed in order to increase the merchandising facilities on the subject 10 acre tract of land. Not at liberty to go into great detail at this time as to whom he represents, or to give much more in the way of particulars as to the plans and intentions of his client. Petitioned rezoning will not only be in the best interest of his client, which is secondary, but of the community as a whole.

Mr. Siebert asked how big a structure would be placed on the lower parcel that has until now been "J" parking, and Mr. Davis replied that it would be placed at the south end of the property, west of the center curb cuts, and would be given the necessary setback to provide the aesthetic qualities. I have not seen the plans which are in a preliminary stage, but I am of the opinion that this building would not exceed 20,000 square feet or 100 feet wide.

Mr. Guernsey asked if Mr. Davis client would be opposed to reasonable screening requirements in regard to the housing project adjacent, and Mr. Davis replied he thought his client would meet any reasonable demand.

Further discussion followed.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-89-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone the property at 4227 Pleasant Grove Road, from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-90-67

Mr. Kenneth Dunham, realtor, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 2816 S. Washington Avenue, from "A" one family to "D-1" professional district.

Mr. Dunham stated he purchased the property for the purpose of relocating his real estate office. After considering several locations, we found this one to be very acceptable, and it has over 19 thousand square feet. If approved, this building would be an asset to the area. Mr. Dunham presented photographs of the proposed building.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-91-67

Morris Reynolds, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 1618 W. Holmes Road, from "A" one family to "D-1" professional.

Mr. Reynolds stated that they had owned the property for many years as a single family residence, but because of the surrounding rezonings of a shopping center and light industrial, he feels the property is no longer suitable for residential. He desires to move his brokerage office onto the property.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-92-67

Mr. George Hutter, attorney, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 3322 N. East Street, from "A" one family to "F" commercial district.

Mr. Hutter stated that his client wants to sell the property as commercial. He described the history of the subject property. There is commercial property surrounding the subject property. The property in question upon annexation to the City was designated "A" one family which is not suitable for this area.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Recess from 10:30 to 10:45 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION MINUTES

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the minutes of May 2, 1967 and May 16, 1967 be approved as printed.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

HEARINGS SET

SS-17-67

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that City Council set a public hearing at which time the Planning Board would consider amending Chapter 36, Code of Ordinance of the City of Lansing, by the following amendment.

Section 36-26 (2) "Funeral homes, hospitals and clinics, excepting veterinary hospitals and clinics."

The Planning Board recommends that this section be deleted from the "D" district, and that Sections 36-26 (4) and 36-26 (3) be renumbered 36-26 (3) and 36-26 (2) if the above amendment is approved.

The Planning Board recommends that the public hearing be set for the Planning Board by the City Council for:

Tuesday, August 15, 1967 at 7:30 P.M., Court Room No. 1, Sixth Floor, City Hall.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

SS-18-67

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that City Council set a public hearing at which time the Planning Board would consider amending Chapter 36, Code of Ordinance of the City of Lansing, by the following amendment.

Section 36-29 (8) "Funeral homes, hospitals and clinics, excepting veterinary hospitals and clinics."

The Planning Board recommends that this section be added to the "D-1" district, and be numbered 36-29 8).

The Planning Board recommends that the public hearing be set for the Planning Board by the City Council for:

Tuesday, August 15, 1967, 7:30 P.M., Court Room No. 1, Sixth Floor, City Hall.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-59-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Leo A. Farhat, acting for William and Dorothy McCurdy, to rezone a parcel at 3831 Moores River Drive and 3500-3800 Cooley Drive, described as:

Lot 4 of McCurdy Acres and Lots 17 and 27 of McCurdy Acres No. 2, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family to "C-2" family be denied.

The Planning Board and City Council considered a request for "C-2" family zoning on these lots in January 1966. The Planning Board recommended the petition be denied and the City Council concurred.

The Board's recommendation was based on the following factors:

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as low density residential (2-3) dwelling units per net acre.

The change will adversely affect living conditions in the area principally through an increase of traffic.

The change would alter the population density pattern and thereby increase the load on public facilities (schools, sewers, streets).

The Committee has examined the new petition with respect to the proposed land use changes in the area, but has not found substantial reasons that are related to the general welfare that would justify this rezoning.

It should be noted that a third lot was originally included in this petition, but was withdrawn because the owner is building a single family home on the lot.

It would appear that this would constitute a grant of a special privilege to individual as contrasted to the general welfare.

There was one objection to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-60-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Kenneth D. Shirey, to rezone a parcel at 1033-1035-1039 S. Pennsylvania and 1011 E. Hazel, described as:

Lots 8, 9, 10, and 11 and the West 40 feet of Lots 12 and 13, in Block 8 of Manufacturers Addition No. 2, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan from "C-2" family and "B-1" family to "E-2" drive-in district be denied.

The site is located on the Northeast corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and Hazel Street. Land use in the area is predominantly residential. This change would be contrary to the established land use pattern.

The future land use plan indicates this area as high density residential. The existing zoning approximates the density proposed in the Master Plan.

The City of Lansing is currently experiencing a severe housing shortage. If this request were granted, the net loss to housing inventory would be seven dwelling units. Also removed would be the potential for additional units which would be built on the vacant lots included in this petition.

In May, 1963 after several joint meetings of the Public Service, Traffic and Planning Board a unanimity of agreement was reached. This agreement approved in principle that the residential integrity of Pennsylvania Avenue should be preserved.

The Committee cannot find any substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accordance with the existing zoning.

Observation of the number of vacant service stations evident in the city would seem to point out the fact that this request is out of scale with the needs of the city.

The housing units which would be demolished are of a substantial nature and do not warrant eradication. These have been checked by Community Renewal.

There were no objections to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following votes:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Fink—1.

Z-71-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Foster and Roxy King, to rezone a parcel at 722-728 N. Pennsylvania Avenue described as:

Lots 2 and 12 Bements Addition, Lot 1 and 13 Bements Addition of that portion of Lot 17 Seymours Subdivision on Section 10, City of Lansing

from "C-2" family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied.

The residential density allowed in the "D-M" district exceeds the density proposed in the Master Plan.

The proposed use would be contrary to the existing and future land use plan.

Sewers serving the area were not designed to handle high density developments, and are overloaded at the present time. A density higher than "C-2" family would compound the problem.

The "C-2" zoning allows reasonable use of the land.

The Planning Board in 1965 and in 1967 considered "D-M" and "D-1" zonings for adjacent parcels to the North, and recommended denial.

Higher density zonings are encouraged in some areas, as in the Central City.

Where this occurs land planning and utility replacement can be done on an orderly, unified, long term basis.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-77-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Arnold H. Kegebein, to rezone a parcel at 921 E. St. Joseph and 720-727 S. Pennsylvania Avenue described as:

Lots 35, 36, 37, 38 of Lansing Improvement, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "C-2" family to "E-2" drive-in district be granted.

This site is located within an isolated area of commercial land use between the proposed I-496 egress ramp and the C. & O. Railroad. Proposed land uses would not affect or deteriorate present residential characteristics of Pennsylvania Ave. a long established policy of the Planning Board in conformance with the Master Plan.

The site is at the egress ramp of I-496 a basic planning concept for the development of new super-service stations. Houses presently on these sites if left in their somewhat run-down residential use, would without a doubt, deteriorate even further as they will be pocketed and isolated between the freeway and the railroad.

The site is adequate in size to physically "open-up" the ramp intersection with Pennsylvania Avenue. Land coverage is presently cluttered with houses obstructing vision at both corners. Proposed land use would provide a wide open space expanse at the corner for a much greater visibility at intersection thus facilitating traffic movements with added safety.

This rezoning will provide for the relocation of a presently accepted "going" neighborhood business which is in I-496 right-of-way and generally improve the mixed land uses within this pocket.

No objections were made to this proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Duncan, Reynolds, Siebert and Fink—6.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Duncan—1.

Z-75-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Arnold H. Kegebein, to rezone a parcel at 715-721 S. Pennsylvania and 1009 E. St. Joseph Street described as:

Lots 10, 11 and 12 of Lansing Improvement, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "C-2" family to "E-2" drive-in district be granted.

This site is located within an isolated area of commercial land use between the proposed I-496 egress ramp and the C. & O. Railroad. Proposed land uses would not affect or deteriorate present residential characteristics of Pennsylvania Ave. a long established policy of the Planning Board in conformance with the Master Plan.

The site is at the egress ramp of I-496 a basic planning concept for the development of new super-service stations. Houses presently on these sites if left in their somewhat run-down residential use, would without a doubt, deteriorate even further as they will be pocketed and isolated between the freeway and the railroad.

The site is adequate in size to physically "open-up" the ramp intersection with Pennsylvania Avenue. Land coverage is presently cluttered with houses obstructing vision at both corners. Proposed land use would provide a wide open space expanse at the corner for a much greater visibility at intersection thus facilitating traffic movements with added safety.

This rezoning will provide for the relocation of a presently accepted "going" neighborhood business which is in I-496 right-of-way and generally improve the mixed land uses within this pocket.

No objection were made to this proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Duncan, Reynolds, Siebert and Fink—7.

Nays: None.

Z-76-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Arnold H. Kegebein, to rezone a parcel at 912, 922, 924 S. Pennsylvania Avenue described as:

Lots 1, 2, 3, 4 of Raiders Addition, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "C-2" family to "E-2" drive-in district be denied.

It is difficult to establish the number of service stations needed to serve the community. The number of stations needed is dependent upon the number of cars to be serviced which in turn depends not only on the number of families but also on their economic status and habits of travel. Another factor complicating the picture is the number of non-resident and commuter traffic to be served in the city, which depends, among other things upon the automotive service facilities available in the suburban and fringe areas, the number of out-of-town vehicles which regularly pass through the community, and the origin and destination characteristics of the cars and trucks. The quality and size of the stations is also a factor which must be considered.

The request for rezoning is obviously made to permit the construction of service station to serve the proposed I-496 cross-town freeway.

This freeway is designed as a limited access facility. Designated points of access occur at frequent intervals along the route. The average length of a trip is much shorter than generally realized. Studies by the Bureau of Public Roads indicate that almost 60% of all trips are less than five miles in length, and less than one percent are over 100 miles in length. Since most trips over limited access routes are relatively short, and access points are spaced at frequent intervals along the route, it seems logical that most drivers will purchase gasoline prior to entering or after leaving route. The primary destinations of traffic using I-496 lie in three areas: the Central Business District, the Capitol Complex and the Oldsmobile Industrial Complex. None of these areas are served directly by Pennsylvania Avenue Interchange.

Based on these facts it would appear that three Service Stations at this intersection would be considerably in excess of the needs of the city.

Excessive clustering of service stations around freeway exits and entrances obstruct traffic movement on the feeder streets. Too many service stations in a given area frequently increase competition, which because gasoline is sold at a relatively standardized price, is based on better, faster and more courteous service, and also unfortunately on brighter lights, on bigger signs, and on more vari-colored pennants strung pole to pole.

Areas around these access points can easily take on a carnival atmosphere of advertising devices clamoring for the motorist's attention.

The end result will be negation of the operational characteristics of the interchange and the creation of future sources of blight in the area.

It should be noted that in May, 1963 after several joint meetings of the Public Service, Traffic and Planning Boards an unanimity of agreement was reached. This agreement approved in principle that the residential integrity of Pennsylvania Avenue should be preserved.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Fink, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-78-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Black, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Joe D. Pentecost, to rezone a parcel at 6045 S. Cedar Street from "E-2" drive-in to "E-1" drive-in be denied as filed, and that the

East 10 ft. of the property

be zoned "J" parking and

The balance of the property

be zoned "E-1" drive-in shop, with screening to be provided along the East property line. Screening to consist of one of the following:

A 3 ft. high chain link fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 5 ft. to 5 ft. 6 in.

A 5 ft. high chain link fence with interwoven slats.

Any other type of screening that may be suggested by the developer, with the approval of the Planning Department.

The change would not be contrary to the established land use pattern.

Land use and zoning north, south, and west of the subject property is of a commercial nature.

The present zoning ("E-2" drive-in) limits development of the site to a gasoline service station.

This parcel is part of the existing service station immediately to the south.

It is reasonable to assume that the site will not develop in accord with the existing zoning.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-1-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by George Parisian, to rezone a parcel at 2330 Forest Road, from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple district be denied.

The property does not meet the criteria established by the Planning Board for the location of multiple family development.

On or close to an intersection of major thoroughfares.

On or close to major thoroughfare, and abutting a parkway, river or like open space of a passive nature.

Within easy walking distance of a shopping center.

Within easy walking distance of amenities such as parks and recreation, both public and commercial.

Strategically located in relation to centers of employment and the Central Business District.

Utility capacity that can handle not only the increase of density of one particular lot, but would have capacity to handle the increase of all other similar lots were to be allowed the same privilege. Public Service has indicated that sanitary sewer is available in Forest Road, and that storm sewer is not available at the present time.

In event that the apartments are designed to accommodate children, the local school situation is to be considered, both proximity and capacity.

The Board of Education has indicated that the schools in the area will soon be overcrowded, and at the present time there are no more monies for expansion.

Available mass transportation facility.

The change would be contrary to the established land use pattern.

Development surrounding this site is predominately single family residential.

The proposed change would be contrary to the Master Land Use Plan.

The Master Land Use Plan proposes this area for low density residential development.

The basic land use conditions have not been changed in this area that would warrant a change as requested.

The change will adversely affect living conditions in the immediate area, principally through the increase of traffic and activity.

The change could deter the improvement or development of adjacent properties in accord with existing regulations.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be developed in accord with existing regulations.

Recent Master Plan revision studies for this area indicates multiple family development to occur adjacent to potential park land development along major arterials, at the intersection of major streets, or as a transitional use between single family development and more intensive uses.

Approximately twenty persons appeared in opposition to this proposed amendment, and approximately five persons appeared in favor.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-43-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Glen E. Dean, to rezone a parcel at 820 and 822 N. Chestnut and 426 W. Madison, from "C-2" family to "D-M" multiple district be granted.

The site under consideration is proposed for multi-family development as indicated on the Central City Development Plan.

A letter from the Public Service Department was submitted by the petitioner, indicating that sewers are available to handle the development that can occur with this proposed change.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-50-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Kenneth De Kubber, to rezone a parcel at 2919 Aurelius Road, from "A" one residence to "D-M" multiple district be denied.

The change would be contrary to the established land use pattern.

Land use development in the vicinity of this site is predominantly single family residential.

The change would create an isolated district i.e., this would be a spot zone.

The basic land use conditions have not changed in this area.

The area is not served with storm sewer.

Impervious development created by apartments, and their off-street parking, would create problems with storm water on the site, and adjacent property owners.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be developed in accordance with the existing zoning.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-51-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Wayne Beers, to rezone a parcel at 634 Carrier Street, from "A" one family to "C-2" family district be denied.

If this change of zoning were granted it would be difficult if not impossible to deny similar changes on existing properties and ultimately up and down the street. Soon there would be an intermingling of uses, thus defeating one of the basic purposes for which the Zoning Ordinance was developed to implement the comprehensive plan.

The change of zoning would confer upon the petitioner a special privilege as contrasted to the general welfare of the community.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with the existing zoning.

There is a substantial amount of land zoned for this type of use.

The area is not served with storm sewer.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-52-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Harry E. Thompson, to rezone a parcel at 3055 E. Michigan Avenue, from "A" one family to "F" commercial and "J" parking be granted and zoned as follows:

The North 60 ft. and the East 40 ft. be zoned "J" parking and

The balance of the property be zoned "F" commercial.

The change would not be contrary to the established land use.

The site is exposed to commercial development on all sides.

The change would not be contrary to the Master Land Use Plan.

The Master Plan indicates a regional shopping center in this general area, which is fully developed.

The property owners are limited to the amount of improvements on expansion on the site.

The use is non-conforming expansion or improvements are limited under the present zoning.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-53-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Charles L. Laing, to rezone a parcel at 700 River Street, from "D" apartment to "F" commercial be denied.

The Planning Board adopted and sent to Council, March 30, 1967 a development plan which recommends that future development in this area be high density residential with a maximum of open space. Commercial type zoning would not be compatible with the plan as adopted.

The lot is too small to be anything other than a spot-zone. There is no opportunity to provide off-street parking for customers.

The non-conforming use status would allow reasonable use of land and building.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-54-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Leo A. Farhat, acting for John Tyler, to rezone a parcel at 400 South Butler, from "C-2" family to "F" commercial district be denied.

The property under consideration was considered for commercial development by the Planning Board on October 6, 1965, by the Board of Zoning Appeals on May 6, 1965, and again by the Planning Board on December 6, 1966, in all cases the requests were denied.

October 6, 1965 the Planning Board denied the request for the following reasons:

"The Board feels that efforts should be made to discourage development which may ultimately result in an area becoming commercially developed in a strip fashion. This reduces initially the carrying capacity of the roadway because of fractional movements which slows traffic. Ultimately because of the increasing traffic volumes and the need for elimination of curb parking upon which the activity rallies, economic starvation of the commercial enterprise occurs."

City Council concurred in this recommendation December 21, 1965.

An appeal was filed December 31, 1965 requesting use of a portion of the residence as a barber shop. This request was denied by the Appeals Board May 6, 1965 for the following reasons:

"Supported by an opinion of the City Attorney it was found that the request was not within the jurisdiction of the Appeals Board."

On December 6, 1966 the Planning Board again considered a rezoning request. The Planning Board reaffirmed their action with the following:

"This site has not been adversely affected in any way, by either land use, or zoning changes since the previous determination and recommendations which would justify an amendment to the Zoning Code.

The Board further believes that the site is too small to support any type of commercial development, and provide for ade-

quate off-street parking, and too small to provide adequate distance from adjacent residential development to protect the residences from the adverse influence of a commercial use.

The Central City Plan indicates this area to be developed in multi-family two story townhouses.

The Board further recommends that the applicant consider locating within the blocks bounded by Logan, Hillsdale, Butler and St. Joseph, which has been recognized for commercial development."

The City Council concurred in this recommendation April 4, 1967.

The Committee does not believe that there have been any further changing conditions that would warrant the change of zoning as now requested.

There were no objections to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-56-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Leo A. Farhat, acting for Don Verderes, to rezone a parcel at 2230 Dunlap, from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple district be denied.

The change would be contrary to the established land use pattern.

Development in the vicinity consists of single family residential homes.

The change would create an isolated district unrelated to similar districts; i.e., this would be a spot-zone.

The proposed change would be contrary to the Master Land Use Plan.

The Master Plan indicates low density residential developments for this area (2-3 dwelling units per acre).

The proposed change would adversely affect living conditions in the immediate area, principally through the increase in traffic and activity and encourage others toward over use of the land.

The change could deter the improvement or development of adjacent property in accord with existing regulations.

This is especially true when there is no land use transition between the apartment developments and single family home owner.

There is new single family development occurring in this area, which is a substantial reason to indicate that it is not impossible to develop the land in accord with the existing zoning.

The petitioner in support of his request quoted a news article favoring mixed densities. The Planning Board agrees with this philosophy when done as provided in the Community Unit Plan, i.e., a planned situation with proper relationships and safeguards built into the plan prior to development.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-57-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Leo A. Farhat, acting for Warner and Long Development Co. Inc., to rezone a parcel at 3328 West Jolly Road, from "C-2" family to "D-M" multiple district be denied.

The Planning Board and City Council considered a petition for rezoning on this property in March 1967. The request for rezoning was for "D-M" multiple dwelling. The Planning Board found that "C-2" family zoning allowed reasonable use of the property, with minimal adverse affects on the adjacent single family residential development.

The City Council concurred with the Planning Board's recommendation and rezoned the property "C-2" residential.

The Committee has examined this petition and cannot find any changed conditions which would justify this request.

No objections were made to the proposed amendments.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-61-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Leo A. Farhat, acting for J. C. Walters and Fred S. Vorn, to rezone a parcel in the 100 block East Saginaw Street described as:

Commencing at the Northwest corner of Lot 1, Block 53, Original Plat, thence South 11 rods; thence East 7 rods, thence North 103.75 feet; thence West 4½ rods, thence North 77.75 feet; thence West 2½ rods to the point of beginning. Also the West 186 feet of the South 5 rods of the North 16 rods of Lot 1, Block 53, Original Plat, City of Lansing. Also the South 26½ feet of Lot 4 and the North 20 feet of Lot 3, Block 53, Original Plat, City of Lansing. To include any and all driveway rights of record; and subject to restrictions, rights and easements of record also that part of Lot 1, Block 53 of the Original Plat, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, according to the plat thereof recorded in Liber 2 of Plats, Page 36, 37, and 38, Ingham County Records, described as: Beginning at a point which is West 173.25 feet and North 41.25 feet from the intersection of the centerline of Saginaw Street and the centerline of Grand Avenue, extended; thence North a distance of 123.75 feet; thence East a distance of 99 feet; thence South a distance of 123.75 feet to the North line of Saginaw Street; thence West a distance of 99 feet to the point of beginning, except the North 88 feet of the West 7 rods of Lot 1, Block 53, Original Plat.

from "D-1" professional to "G" business district be denied.

On August 9, 1966 the applicant requested a change of zoning from "H" to "G" which would allow a four story office building to be erected on the site. This was not possible in the "H" light industrial district because of the height limitations.

On August 12, 1966, the applicant requested a waiver of the height limitations of the "H" light industrial district to the Board of Zoning Appeals. On August 26, 1966 the Board of Zoning Appeals considered the request and tabled the matter pending the Planning Board recommendation of the zoning request.

The Staff and Planning Board recommended that this property be zoned "D-1" professional offices district. This recommendation was forwarded to City Council on September 21st.

The Board considered the following factors in making their recommendation:

The Board is not adverse to office use on the site, but believes that general business with 120 ft. height limitations would not be in the best interest of the city or in accordance with good planning principles.

The Secretary of the Planning Board was directed to forward the information to the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Based on this recommendation and other testimony and evidence presented to the Board of Zoning Appeals by the applicant, the Board of Zoning Appeals granted the request permitting a structure to be erected on the subject property to a height of three stories or 45 feet.

The Board believes that the city has acted in good faith in this matter allowing relief from the strict application of the Zoning Code permitting the development of the property in accordance with the development in the area. Not overlooking the fact that the property borders the area proposed for Lansing Community College expansion, it is generally agreed between the Community College and the City of Lansing, that future development adjacent to the Community College be directed toward compatible and desirable development. Future renewal action would be directed toward the same end.

The City Council rezoned the property to "F-1" commercial, "D-1" professional and "J" parking March 13, 1967.

On April 4, 1967 Councilman Bradshaw, requested that the Planning Board reconsider the zoning in the entire block bound by Washington, Madison, Grand and Saginaw Streets.

On June 20, 1967 the Planning Board considered this request and reaffirmed their previous action. (Recommending "D-1" professional).

The Committee does not believe that conditions have changed or are expected to change in the vicinity, that would warrant a change of zoning as requested.

No objections to this proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-62-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Alberta Rahfeldt, to rezone a parcel at 530 Community Street, from "A" one family to "C-2" family district be denied.

The proposed change would be contrary to the established land use pattern.

Zoning and land use development in the immediate vicinity is single family residential.

The change may foster uncontrolled development in the vicinity, and lead to undesirable mixed land use.

This could become an acute problem in an area such as this, where vacant lots are prevalent.

There are no storm sewers serving this area nor have street improvements (curb, gutter, sidewalk) been constructed.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be developed in accord with the existing zoning.

There are two family zoning near Paulson and North East Street that could be used with a minimum of time and construction.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-63-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Homer Taylor, to rezone a parcel located on Hazelwood Street and Dunkel Road described as:

Lots 27, 28, 30 Green Acres Subdivision, City of Lansing

from "A" residential to "G-2" wholesale district be denied.

The change would be contrary to the established land use in the area, and also contrary to the Master Plan for future land use in the area. The site is within the area being studied for a Master Plan Revision, and even in the tentative new land-use plan the proposed use would be in conflict.

No other properties have an exit onto Dunkel Road at present. If this is preserved in the future it would be necessary for the petitioner to have an exit onto a residential street. This would be undesirable.

No sewers exist in the area at present, and none are programmed for the near future. Septic tanks permits have been turned down recently in the area and there have been cases of hepatitis due to contaminated well water supplies.

There is a large amount of vacant industrial land with utilities ready for development in the general area.

There is no substantial reason why the property cannot be developed under the existing zoning.

This would be a spot-zone highly unrelated to anything present or planned.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-65-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Major Kristian T. Anderson, acting for the Salvation Army, to rezone a parcel at 1501 Windsor Street, from "A" residential to "B" one family be denied.

The only space available for off-street parking is occupied by a small playlot. The streets bordering the site have only 20 feet of pavement and parking on them should not be encouraged. The church does function as a community center, and serves the people in this neighborhood. The parking needs are probably considerably less than most churches, but in any case cannot be completely disregarded.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-64-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Donald M. Quimby, to rezone a parcel at 4918 Pleasant Grove Road described as:

E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of Lot 111, Eco Farms Subdivision, and W. $\frac{1}{2}$ of Lot 111, Eco Farms Subdivision

from "A" single family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied.

The change would be contrary to the established land use pattern.

Land use and zoning in the vicinity of the site is single family residential.

The proposed change would allow buildings to be constructed, that would be completely out of character with the developed area.

The basic land use conditions have not changed in this area that would warrant a change as requested.

The change would adversely affect living conditions in the immediate area, principally through the increase in traffic and activity.

This is especially true if the property were to develop to the highest intensity under the "D-M" multiple district.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be used and developed in accord with the existing zoning.

The lot is of sufficient size, with frontage on two public streets that another single family dwelling could be constructed. The Committee believes this would allow reasonable use of the land.

The basic conditions conducive to apartment development do not exist at this location.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-66-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by T. G. McGurkin, Jr., acting for Edward W. Sparrow Hospital, to rezone a parcel at 215 North Holmes, from "C-2" family to "J" parking be granted.

Screening to be provided along the North property line, except for a 10 ft. set-back on Holmes Street, screening to consist of one of the following:

A 5 ft. high dense privit hedge.

A 5 ft. high chain link fence with interwoven redwood slats.

Any other type of screening that may be suggested by this property owner with approval of the Planning Department.

The site under consideration is adjacent to and would be a continuation of the existing hospital parking facilities.

Petitioner alleges that off-street parking is critical, and this request will help alleviate the problem.

The size of the parcel is 40 ft. x 84 ft. (3,360 sq. ft.), is below the minimum requirements of the Zoning Code for both single family and two family developments.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Duncan—1.

Z-67-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by James and Joan Weller, to rezone a parcel at 4728 and 4732 Hughes Road, described as:

Lots 106 and 107 of Pleasant Grove Subdivision, City of Lansing, Michigan

from "A" residential to "C-2" family be denied.

The change in zoning would be contrary to the established land use in the neighborhood and would be a spot-zone. The existing development is all "A" residential.

The proposed change would be contrary to the land use plan for the area. The Master Plan indicates single family uses for the neighborhood.

Other vacant lots in the neighborhood would have to be treated equally if the request were to be granted.

The lots are narrow by modern land subdivision standards and allowing a higher density on such lots would be compounding the problem.

There is no substantial reason why the land cannot be developed under the existing zoning.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-68-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Curtis L. Welty, to rezone a parcel at 613 West Kalamazoo Street, from "D" apartment to "E" apartment be denied.

The Committee further recommends that the recommendations, and guide lines of the Central City Plan be followed.

The Central City Plan indicates this area to be developed in multiple dwellings, at a maximum height of four stories.

A change of zoning would be contrary to the Central City Development Plan, and would jeopardize the proposed land use within the entire plan.

There are areas within the Central City Development Plan, that are proposed and would accommodate the proposed use.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot continue to be used or developed in accord with the existing zoning regulations.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-72-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by William H. Hoefflinger, to rezone a parcel at 1313 and 1315 East Main Street described as:

Lot No. 8 and 9 of Excelsior Land Company's Subdivision of a part of the West half ($\frac{1}{2}$) of the Northeast quarter ($\frac{1}{4}$) of Section twenty-two (22) T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingman County, Michigan

from "B-1" family to "C-2" family be granted.

The change as proposed will help preserve the area for residential use and will help alleviate the housing shortage.

The change will provide a transition between the commercial and residential uses.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-73-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Inez B. Sanders, to rezone a parcel at 2236 North Grand River Avenue, from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be granted.

Commercial zoning on this site could foster further requests and ultimately

lead to strip commercial zoning which is not in keeping with the Master Plan.

"D-M" zoning would allow reasonable use of the land in relation to the existing land uses.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-74-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Alan H. Ginsberg, to rezone a parcel at the N.E. corner Holmes and Logan, from Commercial and "J" parking to Commercial and "J" parking (re-distributed) be denied as filed and the property be zoned as follows:

Beginning at a point on the E. line of Logan Street which is S. $01^{\circ} 49'$ E. 661.71 ft. from the E. and W. $\frac{1}{4}$ line of the S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 29, T4N, R2W, thence East 795.0 ft.; thence North 170.0 ft.; thence East 275 ft.; thence S. 75° E. 110.68 ft.; thence N. $31^{\circ} 04'$ E. 608.87 ft.; thence N. $89^{\circ} 55'$ W. along the E. and W. $\frac{1}{4}$ line 611.9 ft.; thence S. $01^{\circ} 06'$ E. 245 ft.; thence N. $89^{\circ} 58'$ W. 515.0 ft.; thence S. $01^{\circ} 15'$ E. 5.00 ft.; thence N. $89^{\circ} 55'$ W. 418.01 ft.; thence S. $01^{\circ} 49'$ E. 411.70 to the point of beginning

be zoned "D-M" district

Beginning at a point which is S. $01^{\circ} 49'$ W. 661.71 ft., East 165.00 ft. and South 20 ft. from the intersection of the East line of Logan Street and the E. and W. $\frac{1}{4}$ line of the S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 29, T4N, R2W; thence S. 270 ft.; thence East 630 ft.; thence North 20 ft.; thence N. $31^{\circ} 04'$ E. 251.92 ft.; thence North 224.22 feet; thence West 130 ft.; thence South 190 ft.; thence West 630 ft. to the point of beginning

be zoned "F" commercial district

Beginning at a point on the East line of Logan Street which is S. $01^{\circ} 49'$ E. 661.71 ft. from the E. and W. $\frac{1}{4}$ line of the S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 29, T4N, R2W; thence S. $01^{\circ} 49'$ E. 342.0 ft.; thence S. $01^{\circ} 54'$ W. 107.96 ft.; thence East 150.0; thence S. $01^{\circ} 54'$ W. 150.0 ft.; thence East along the North line of Holmes Road 388.21 feet; thence N. $31^{\circ} 04'$ E. 155.0 feet; thence East 190.00 feet; thence N. $31^{\circ} 04'$ E. 710.08 ft.; thence N. 75° W. 110.68 ft.; thence West 145.00 ft.; thence South 224.22 ft.; thence S. $31^{\circ} 04'$ W. 251.92

ft.; thence South 20 ft.; thence West 630 ft.; thence North 270 ft.; thence East 630 ft.; thence North 20 ft.; thence West 795.0 ft. to the point of beginning

be zoned "J" parking district

Apartments at this location would be complimentary and convenient to the existing and proposed commercial. It would be served by two major thoroughfares without affecting any single family residential development. Would be within three blocks of a fully developed park and recreation area, are strategically located in relation to employment centers (5 minutes to the Oldsmobile Plant), are also so located that utilities are not a critical factor.

With screening to be provided along the North and West lines of the "J" parking areas. Screening to consist of the following:

A 6 ft. high chain link fence with interwoven redwood slats.

Or any other type of screening that may be suggested by the developer, with approval of the Planning Board.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Siebert and Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Guernsey announced that the date of July 19 at 7:00 P.M. in the Board of Water and Light Board room had been set to review the analog model as presented by the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission. The aforementioned time and date to be confirmed.

Motion by Black, seconded by Duncan, that Mr. Guernsey be authorized to attend the IBM data processing and Urban Planning School.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Duncan, seconded by Reynolds, that the application to participate in the Community Shelter Program be submitted to the Board at their next regular meeting.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Meeting adjourned at 12:01 A.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

T/C

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, August 1, 1967

August 1, 1967

Court Room No. 1

Sixth Floor

7:30 P.M.

City Hall

Meeting called to order at 7:32 P.M. by Vice Chairman Kenneth Black.

Present: Black, Heino, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—5.

Absent: Bretz, Duncan and Fink—3.

HEARINGS

Mr. Black announced that since a quorum of six members of the Board was not present the Board would not be able to act on any of the pending zoning matters. Those pending matters were referred to August 15, 1967 regular meeting of the Planning Board.

S-10-67P Warehouse Development Company, Preliminary Plat

Mr. Edwin P. Brown, Assistant Planning Director, discussed the location, proposed street, the land use in the surrounding area, and the proposed use of the property.

Mr. Vince Oliver, representing the petitioners in this matter, stated it was his opinion that this proposed development would be an asset to the community and the neighborhood.

Mr. Siebert asked which lots Lansing Wholesale Grocers would be using, and Mr. Oliver replied they anticipated the first building would be on Lot No. 1, which would be the cash and carry and produce building to replace their present structure on Hosmer Street.

Mr. Black asked if it was necessary that the plat for the whole development be approved before the building be constructed, and Mr. Oliver replied they could get a building permit for one building without

the platting, but they are anxious to begin the development of the entire site.

Mr. Guernsey asked if the owners of the property had conferred with Mr. Lindell in regard to the property at the south, and Mr. Oliver replied that they have current negotiations with the Lindell Company to include the southern portion of their property in the overall development. If this takes place then we would be assured our access on Holmes Road, and it is possible it could change the alignment of the road for better land use.

Further discussion followed.

Mr. Bruce Wolever, property owner at 1219 Victor Street, appeared in opposition to the proposed development.

Property owners at 1607 Holly Way, commented in regard to the road location in the proposed development.

Mr. Clark of Clark's Gun Shop, 2800 South Logan Street, spoke in regard to the proposed road, the posting of the proposed rezoning of the subject property, and questioned the rezoning of Lots 5, 6, 7, 8 stating that the petitioners do not own these parcels. Mr. Oliver stated the lots in question are under option to Wholesale Grocers.

Mr. Black remarked that Mr. Clark's statements would be checked into.

Mr. Clark then commented in regard to the traffic congestion on the corner of Victor and Logan.

Mr. Seman, 1311 Victor Avenue, asked if it would be possible that the Warehouse Company be required to maintain a smokeless and odorless burning of the waste, and that it be used daily to protect the health and welfare of the surrounding area. Mr. Seman then asked for clarification of the screening requirements and also that the layout be changed to have the landscaping come first, then the fence and then the parking behind the property owners on Victor Street.

Mr. Oliver commented that they are in the process of drawing written proposals

to present to abutting property owners in regard to the 20 ft. strip behind the property lines.

Robert Beatman, 1810 South Holly Way, stated his disappointment in the proposal as presented. He asked that the property owners affected by this development be able to view a completed plot plan and that they would appreciate another public hearing on the matter if possible.

Mr. Guernsey stated that it was possible that the Board could hold another hearing after the Board received a plot plan and development proposal which Wholesale Grocers had agreed to provide.

The property owner at 2714 Marion Avenue, asked the Board to keep in mind the welfare of the people bordering the subject property, and also stated that the warehouse would tend to buffer the noise of the drop forge.

Further discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

SS-12-67

Amendment to the Zoning Code in the "E-2" district.

No one appeared in regard to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Ordinance Committee.

Z-93-67

Mr. Clark, 2800 S. Logan Street, the petitioner, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at the 1100 block of Victor Avenue, from "B-1" family to "H" light industrial.

Mr. Clark stated that he wants to put a garage on the subject property, the size being 24 ft. by 24 ft.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-94-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 245 Mosley Avenue, from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-95-67

Mr. Harold Placer, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property on Richmond Street, from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Mr. Placer stated it was his intention to put 2 eight unit apartment buildings on the subject property. He asked if the Board desired a plot plan?

Mr. Guernsey commented that in the past the Board has not considered multiple family zoning for this area, rather a Community Unit Plan approach, the allowable density being different.

Mr. Siebert asked where the access would be to the site, and Mr. Placer replied it would be Ferrol Street.

Mr. Black asked that the petitioner furnish the Board with a site plan in time for the next Zoning Committee meeting.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-97-67

Mr. James Covello, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone the property at 4316 S. Logan Street, from "J" parking to "F" commercial district.

Mr. Covello presented a plan showing the proposed layout of the property which is the M-9 Market. They wish to add on to the present building.

Further discussion followed.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-98-67

No one appeared in regards to the petition to rezone property at 5303 South Logan Street, from "A" one non-conforming use to "F" commercial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-99-67

This is a petition to rezone property at 3337 and 3345 South Washington Avenue, from "A" one, "F" and "J" to "E-2" drive-in district. A letter from Mr. Leo Farhat, dated July 31, 1967 was received which asked that this petition be held over

until the regular meeting of the Planning Board on Tuesday, September 5, 1967. This matter was then placed on the September 5th agenda.

Z-10-67

Mr. Lee Halstead, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at the 5500 Block of South Logan Street, from "A" one family to "C-2" family district.

Mr. Halstead discussed the proposed development and stressed the importance and popularity of the two family dwelling.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-102-67

Mr. Lee Halstead, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property on the north side of Malibu Drive, from "A" one family to "C-2" family district.

Mr. Halstead stated he thought the proposed would be an orderly transition from apartment houses to two family to one family homes in the area.

Further discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-96-67

Mr. Robert McCabe, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at the 5000 block of North Grand River Avenue, from "A" one to "F", "J", "D-1" and "D-M" district.

Mr. McCabe presented a proposed rendering of the area which contains 11.94 acres of land. This is not a speculative program, the owners have been approached by various companies and associations to have built for them or to build their own offices. Letter from Michigan Retailers Association requesting occupancy in professional building was read by Mr. McCabe. We also have commitments from a financial institution and from major companies who have expressed desire to enter shopping area.

Mr. Ben Osofsky, representing Howell Apparel Shop in Howell, Michigan, spoke in favor of the proposed development.

Michael Doyle, suggested perhaps it would be better to have a two family buffer instead of the "D-M" multiple behind the property owners on Wilson Street which abuts the proposed development. Mr. Doyle stated that if this development was constructed in the manner presented that it would be an asset to the area.

Mr. Chris Baryames, spoke in favor of the proposed development.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Recess from 9:15 to 9:40 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION HEARINGS SET

Motion by Heino, seconded by Reynolds, that a public hearing date of September 12, 1967 be set for Z-100-67 and Z-104-67 before the Planning Board.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Heino, that the zoning matters on the Board's agenda be referred to the Planning Board meeting of August 15, 1967 due to the lack of quorum.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

RE: Z-11-67

Dr. June requested that the above mentioned (Z-11-67) be referred to the Planning Board meeting of September 5, 1967 in order for him to be present.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Heino, that Z-11-67 be placed on the agenda for the Planning Board meeting of September 5, 1967.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

STREETS COMMITTEE

ROW-8-67

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Siebert, that the Planning Board advise City Council that they considered the request to vacate a portion of an east-west alley that extends between S. Pennsylvania Avenue and Parker Street north of Climax Street.

The following information is submitted:

1. The portion of the alley requested for vacation has a 15 foot width and a length of 352 ft.
2. The abutting property to the north is being purchased by the Michigan State Highway Department as part of the I-496 R.O.W. acquisition.
3. The petition to vacate is signed by six property owners fronting on the north side of Climax Street.

4. Lot No. 13 fronting on S. Pennsylvania Avenue is property of the Board of Water and Light and abuts a portion of the alley on the north side of their lot.
5. The Michigan State Highway Department is closing the west entrance to the alley at S. Pennsylvania Avenue as part of their engineering plans for I-496.

The Michigan State Highway Department is in the process of acquiring all the properties North of the portion of the alley requested for vacation. If the alley is vacated the entire portion of the alley vacated would go to the Michigan State Highway Department, as the petitioners' properties are within a different plat, and a vacated alley is not split between two plats.

The Board of Public Service recommends that no action be taken until after the Department of State Highways has completed acquisition of property on the north side of the alley. Public Service has an 8" sanitary sewer in this alley, if the alley is vacated a full width utility easement would be needed.

Michigan Bell Telephone Company objects to the vacation due to a possible relocation of poles and lines. A utility easement would prevent this and give Michigan Bell access to their equipment.

The Board of Water and Light objects to their vacation and makes the following statement:

"This alley affords the only access to Board of Water and Light Well No. P-20. The Highway Department proposes to close and fence the alley at Pennsylvania Avenue and we will have to enter from Parker Street."

In view of the recommendation cited above it would not be advisable to vacate this portion of the alley at this time. After the Michigan State Highway Department has acquired the property they need and if another solution can be found for means of ingress for the Board of Water and Light to their property, this request for vacation could be considered.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Heino, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—5.

Nays: None.

ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. Black asked if the Planning Department had received any reply from the City Attorney in regards to an opinion on the flood plain ordinance and Mr. Guernsey replied in the negative.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Goals and Program

Mr. Guernsey spoke briefly in regard to the Work Program for the coming year, stating a review of the previous year's goals is in order. A report in this regard will be forthcoming.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letter from the Community Services Council, regarding official representatives to the delegate body from the Planning Board was read to the Board by Mr. Guernsey.

Matter was referred to the Executive Committee.

Letter from Michael Doyle, regarding the proposed "Turnkey" housing on Waverly-Grand River area, was read to the Board by Mr. Guernsey.

Received and placed on file.

Meeting adjourned at 9:53 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

Motion by Houck, supported by McComb that the appeal be granted under Section 36-12 (6) of the Zoning Code. Subject to the following.

- 1) That adequate footings, and all other building requirements as determined by the Building Inspector be complied with.
- 2) That the enclosure be used only as protection for the main structure and not converted into permanent living quarters.

The Board found based on testimony and evidence that many of the dwellings in the vicinity were constructed with large open front porches, some which have been enclosed and made an integral part of the main structure. Due to previous alterations of existing dwellings in the vicinity which has created an irregular front yard set-back. The Board believes that property owners wishing to enclose their front porches are faced with a practical difficulty and that strict application of the Code, in this case would be unreasonable.

The Board does not believe the variation will seriously affect any adjoining property or the general welfare.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Seven.

Nays: Zero.

Gaus arrived at 8:20 P.M.

Motion by Kelly, supported by McComb that the minutes of September 14, 1967 be approved.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Chairman Keep appointed Wendell McComb and Albin Wendrow to recommend arrangements for the Christmas party to be held in December.

Mrs. Mabel Houck announced she would not be able to attend the November 9, 1967 Board of Appeals meeting.

Motion by Jones, supported by McComb to adjourn.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Adjourn at 8:30 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, August 15, 1967

Meeting called to order at 7:42 P.M. by Vice Chairman Kenneth Black.

Present: Black, Duncan, Fink, and Heino—4.

Absent: Bretz, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—4.

matter be adjourned by the Board until their next regular meeting pending interim developments.

In view of this opinion, the public hearing on S-11-67P was referred to a later date.

Mrs. Bretz and Mr. Reynolds arrived at 7:50 P.M.

Mrs. Bretz assumed the chair.

SS-17-67 and SS-18-67

Amendments to the Zoning Code "D" District and "D-1" District

Mr. Brown stated that the Zoning Code was written in 1942 and the purpose of the amendment is to update the Code. He explained that the "D" apartment district was intended to be an apartment district, and is basically for residential use. The changing character of funeral homes, hospitals, and clinics and their effect upon the neighborhood in traffic generation, noise and parking areas makes these uses undesirable in the "D" apartment district. The subject uses would be more compatible with the allied professional uses allowed under the "D-1" district. This is under consideration.

The following changes in the Zoning Code are proposed. The deletion of the following section from the Zoning Code:

"Section 36-26 (2) Funeral homes, hospital, and clinics, excepting veterinary hospitals and clinics." Sections 36-26 (3) and 36-26 (4) would be renumbered to 36-26 (2) and 36-26 (3) if the above amendment is approved.

The addition of the following section to be numbered 36-29 (8) to the Zoning Code:

"Section 36-29 (8) funeral homes, hospitals and clinics, excepting veterinary hospitals and clinics."

No one appeared in regard to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Ordinance Committee.

RE: Z-19-67

Mrs. LaDuke, petitioner, stated that the subject property has been owned by them twenty years as commercial property. Upon annexation to the City the property reverted to "A" one family and the purpose of the petition is to return the property to commercial.

RE: Z-88-67

Harold Davis, stated that he and his client met with Mr. Fine who controls the property at the north and northeast of the subject rezoning. An agreement was reached that before the Board's recommendation to City Council the petitioners will produce a letter agreeing to screenings in such a manner that will make their intended use of the property compatible to the adjacent development.

Recess 8:08 to 8:50 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Fink, seconded by Black, that the Rules of Procedure in regard to an established day for meeting be suspended.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Black, supported by Duncan, that the first meeting of the Board in September be held on September 12, 1967 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1, Sixth Floor, City Hall, rather than on Tuesday September 5, 1967 to avoid possible conflicts in connection with the Labor Day Holiday.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-19-67

Motion by Heino, seconded by Fink, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Bernard LaDuke, to rezone a parcel at 6070 S. Logan from "A" one residential to "F" commercial district, be denied as filed, and that part of the property described as:

Beginning at a point on the South line of Lot 22 of Webster Farms Subdivision which is 20 feet East of the Southwest corner of Lot 22; thence East along the South line of Lots 21 and 22 to a point on the South line of Lot 21 which is 40 feet Northwesterly of (measured at right angles) the Northwesterly line of S. Logan Street; thence Southwesterly along a line 40 feet Northwesterly of and parallel to the Northwesterly line of S. Logan Street to a point which is 20 feet East of the East line of Piper Street; thence North to the beginning

be rezoned from "A" one family residential to "F" commercial, and

That the balance of the property

be rezoned from "A" one family residential to "J" parking.

With screening along the West and North property lines, that may be suggested by the developer with the approval of the Planning Staff.

This change conforms to the proposed South Logan zoning policy in that it is a neighborhood serving use and the districts described above will allow eventual redevelopment of the site to provide adequate setbacks from Logan Street to allow a service drive to minimize vehicular conflicts.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-79-67

Motion by Heino, seconded by Duncan, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Ann T. Elrod, to rezone a parcel at 1027 Seymour Avenue, from "C-2" to "D-M" multiple district be denied.

The change would be contrary to the established land use pattern

a) Land use development in the area with the exception of a church and school site, is one and two family dwelling.

The change would create an isolated district i.e. this would be a spot zone.

The existing development on the site does not lend itself to providing for adequate off-street parking if developed as proposed (4 units requires 8 parking spaces) plus necessary drives.

Sewers serving this development are combined storm and sanitary, and operate at capacity.

The basic land use conditions have not changed in this area; that would warrant a change as requested.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with the existing regulations.

If this request were granted it would lead to an undesirable mixture of land uses.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-80-67

Motion by Heino, seconded by Fink, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Mrs. Betty Brennan, to rezone a parcel at 2801 N. East Street, from "C-2" family to "F" commercial district be denied.

In November 1966 the City Council rezoned this Lot from "A" one residential to "C-2" residential. This change was initiated by the present petitioners and the change was recommended by the Planning Board, based on the following analysis:

"The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as residential."

"The rezoning could establish a trend along this area of N. East Street, that

would be a basis for discouraging future strip commercial development."

The basic land use conditions have not changed in the past six months. The West side of N. East Street in this area is predominantly residential in character.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-81-67

Motion by Heino, seconded by Fink, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Mrs. M. C. Wenzl, to rezone a parcel at 2805 N. East Street from "C-2" family to "F" commercial district be denied.

In November 1966 the City Council rezoned this Lot from "A" one residential to "C-2" residential. This change was initiated by the present petitioners and the change was recommended by the Planning Board, based on the following analysis:

"The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as residential."

"The rezoning could establish a trend along this area of N. East Street, that would be a basis for discouraging future strip commercial development."

The basic land use conditions have not changed in the past six months. The West side of N. East Street in this area is predominantly residential in character.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-82-67

Motion by Heino, seconded by Black, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Donald A. Hines, Attorney, for General Motors Corporation, to rezone a parcel in the 900 block Birch Street, described as:

Lot No. 6, Block No. 2, Sparrow's Subdivision of Lot 1 of Block 14 of Townsend's Subdivision of the North fractional $\frac{1}{2}$ of Section 20, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan and

Lots Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 and the North 90 feet of Lot No. 5, Block No. 2, Cowles Subdivision of Lot 2 of Block 14 of Townsend's Subdivision of the North fractional $\frac{1}{2}$ of Section 20, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan and

The South 80 feet of Lot No. 5, and the South 85 feet of Lot No. 6, and the South 85 feet of the West 11 feet of Lot No. 7, all in Block No. 2, Cowles Subdivision of Lot 2 of Block 14 of Townsend's Subdivision of the North fractional $\frac{1}{2}$ of Section 20, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan and

Lots Nos. 8, 9, 10, and the North 85 feet of Lot No. 6, and all of Lot No. 7 except the South 85 feet of the West 11 feet thereof, all in Block No. 2, Cowles Subdivision of Lot 2 of Block 14 of Townsend's Subdivision of the North fractional $\frac{1}{2}$ of Section 20, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan and

Lot No. 1, except the South 75 feet thereof, Block No. 1, Plat of Holmes and Sons Subdivision of Lot 1 of Block 20 of Townsend's Subdivision on Section 20, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan and

Lot No. 7, Block No. 2, Sparrow's Subdivision of Lot 1 of Block 14 of Townsend's Subdivision of the North fractional $\frac{1}{2}$ of Section 20, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan and

The North 37 feet of the South 75 feet of Lot No. 1, Block No. 1, Plat of Holmes and Sons Subdivision of Lot 1 of Block 20 of Townsend's Subdivision of Section 20, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan and

Lot No. 3 and Lot No. 2 except the South 38 feet thereof, Block No. 1, Plat of Holmes and Sons Subdivision of Lot 1 of Block 20 of Townsend's Subdivision of Section 20, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan and

All of the properties included in the foregoing legal descriptions which are located within the Plat of Holmes and Sons Subdivision are situated at the Southwest corner of Olds Avenue and Birch Street, and

All of the properties included in the foregoing legal descriptions which are located within Cowles Subdivision or Sparrow's Subdivision collectively, make up the West two-thirds (approximately) of the Block bounded by William Street, Logan Street, Olds Avenue, and Birch Street (900 Block of Birch Street)

from "C-2" family, "F" commercial, "B" residential, "D" apartments, "J" parking, "H" light industrial district to 'I' heavy industrial district be granted.

Any change of zoning should be based on a comprehensive plan.

The entire area in which this property is located was, as a result of a special survey, selected as a location best suited for future industrial demands.

Some of the criteria which were used to evaluate potential sites were:

Easy access by rail, highway and air facilities.

Topography-levelness, freedom from flooding or adverse soil conditions.

Easily and economically served with utilities and services.

Effect on surrounding property-absence of nuisance aspect.

Appropriately located so as to be readily accessible to employees from residential areas.

This site meets all of these criteria and as such was designed as an industrial area on the Master Plan.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nay: None.

Z-83-67

Motion by Heino, seconded by Black, that the petition to rezone property at 2221 E. Kalamazoo Street, from "B-1" family to "F" commercial district be tabled 30 days to allow the Staff to explore the possibility of an appeal to remodel the store front.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yea: Black and Heino—2.

Nay: Bretz, Duncan, Fink and Reynolds—4.

Motion by Duncan, seconded by Fink, to grant the petitioner to rezone property at 2221 E. Kalamazoo Street, from "B-1" family to "F" commercial district, failed by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Duncan, Fink and Reynolds—4.

Nay: Black and Heino—2.

The department made the following analysis:

The Planning Board did not recommend the petition by Claude M. Guthrie, to rezone a parcel at 2221 E. Kalamazoo Street, from "B-1" family to "F" commercial. The motion to grant received four affirmative and two negative votes.

The department made the following analysis:

Pro:

1. The use of property is non-conforming and structural alterations are limited.
2. The property fronts Kalamazoo Street, a minor arterial.
3. The use is a neighborhood service, and does not appear to generate an excessive amount of traffic.
4. The use cannot expand on the lot—that is, attrition would not occur unless permitted on adjoining or nearby lots by zoning action.

Con:

1. Land use development in the area is predominately single family residential.
2. The change would create an isolated district.
3. There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot continue to be used under the existing regulations, i.e., this permitted to exist as non-conforming.

The Department recommended that the petition be granted.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Z-86-67

Motion by Heino, seconded by Fink, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Duane W. Brown, acting for Clifford and Smith Construction, to rezone a parcel at 3238 W. Holmes Road, from "A" residential to "C-2" family district be granted.

The change would not be contrary to the established land use pattern.

- a) Properties fronting on Holmes Road East and West of this property is zoned and being developed with two family dwellings.

The basic land use conditions have changed in the immediate vicinity that justified this zoning amendment.

The site has ease of access to Holmes Road a major street and will not introduce an excessive amount of traffic into adjacent residential streets.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-87-67

Motion by Heino, seconded by Fink, that consideration was given to an application from Leon L. LeGrand, to rezone two parcels of land fronting on LeGrand Avenue from "A" one family district and "D-M" multiple dwelling district to "C-2" family district and "D-1" professional offices district respectively. Specifically the land for which the application has been has been made, may be described as follows:

Lot 17 and Lot 19, situated in the Meadow Wood Subdivision, being a part of Section 32, T4N, City of Lansing

Pursuant to the above the Board recommended that the application as filed, be denied and that in lieu thereof Lot 19 be rezoned to "C-2" family from its present "A" one family category, and that no action be taken to rezone Lot 17 from its present designation of "D-M" multiple dwelling category.

The site requested for "D-1" professional was considered by the Planning Board for "F" commercial and "J" parking August 4, 1966. The Board recommended denial for the following reasons:

This request does not fall within the overall zoning policy of South Logan Street introduced and adopted by the Planning Board May 4, 1965.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as residential.

Commercial uses adjacent to residential uses is detrimental to both.

Strip commercial development along major streets, tends to reduce the traffic carrying capacity.

There is adequate commercial zoning in the area to accommodate present and future development.

The site immediately to the South was also considered for "F" commercial and "J" parking and recommended for denial for essentially the same reasons as above. The City Council rezoned this parcel to "D-M" multiple. A 12 unit apartment building has recently been constructed on this site. There is land zoned commercial nearby that could be utilized for offices and should be developed before intruding commercial uses into residential areas.

The Board does not believe that conditions have changed that justify a change on Lot 17 to "D-1" professional, but believe that "C-2" zoning on Lot 19 would provide a proper transition between the apartment development and the existing single family development to the East.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-88-67

Motion by Heino, seconded by Duncan that the petition be tabled to September 12th pending submission of a site plan.

Motion failed by a vote of six nays and no yeas.

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Duncan, that the rules be suspended to allow Mr. Davis, the petitioner, to speak in regard to Z-88-67 a request to rezone property at 3301 E. Michigan Avenue, from "D-M" multiple and "J" parking to "F" commercial district.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Davis stated that to delay a decision on this matter would not be of any help to the proposed project, that it is quite important to the project that a decision by the Planning Board be reached prior to September 1st. As far as securing a site plan at this time or between now and September 1st or 12th, he was dubious that this could be done. There are no drawings available. Mr. Davis asked the purpose of the request for a site plan.

Mr. Fink stated that the concern here is that the land directly to the East of the proposed project which is to be developed with multiple dwelling use. Questioned the effect of the proposed commercial development in connection with the already committed recommendation that the land to the East be developed with multiple dwellings.

Further discussion followed.

Motion by Black, seconded by Reynolds, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by H. M. Davis, to rezone a parcel at 3301 E. Michigan Avenue, from "J" and "D-M" to "F" and "J" be zoned "F" commercial and "J" parking in accordance with a site plan to be submitted that would reflect the following:

Off-street parking one (1) for each three hundred (300) square feet of useable floor space. Also screening to be provided adjacent to the residential zoned property. Proper setbacks off Michigan Avenue.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-89-67

Motion by Heino, seconded by Reynolds, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Kenneth and Beatrice Yager, to rezone a parcel at 4227 Pleasant Grove Road, from "A" one residential to multiple dwelling district be denied as filed, and that the property be zoned "C-2" family district.

The change would be contrary to the established land use pattern.

Development in the area with the exception of the school to the South is single family residential.

The basic land use conditions have not changed in this area that would justify this change of zoning.

The change would adversely affect living conditions of the adjacent residential properties principally through the increase of traffic and activity.

This does not meet criteria for apartment development: i.e., of adjacent to shopping, on or close to the intersection of major thoroughfares.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-90-67

Motion by Heino, seconded by Reynolds, that the petitioner's request to table this petition until September 12, 1967 be approved.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-91-67

Motion by Heino, seconded by Fink, that the petition to rezone property at 1618 W.

Holmes Road, from "A" one family to "D-1" professional office district be denied and that the property be rezoned "C-2" family.

Mr. Reynolds questioned the rezoning of this parcel to "C-2" when the property on both sides is "A" one and the property in the rear "H" light industrial.

Further discussion followed.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Reynolds that the petition be tabled not more than 60 days to allow a comprehensive study of the area as to the compatibility of residential with light industrial.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nay: None.

Z-92-67

Motion by Heino, seconded by Fink, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition to rezone property at 3322 N. East Street, from "A" one family to "F" commercial be denied and gives the following reasons in support of its position.

This rezoning is inconsistent with the Master Plan which designates N. East Street as a residential area.

The present highway orientation is of course short range in view at the proposed extension of U.S. 127 North and consequent abandonment of N. East as a trunk highway thereby reducing the pressure for commercial uses.

Strip commercial development along the city's streets is not generally a desirable type of development and should be discouraged wherever possible. This unrestricted haphazard development can injuriously affect the abutting residences along the side streets leading to said highway.

The long range plan should envision consolidation of commercial areas to key areas which can be substantiated on a basis of local service and need.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nay: None.

Z-138-65

Motion by Heino, seconded by Fink, that the Planning Board advise City Council,

that they approved unanimously the following changes in the Community Unit Plan of Mr. Bruce Hartwick at 2431 N. Grand River Avenue.

1. The addition of 12,555 square feet to the site in the form of a strip of land 31 feet by 405 feet.

a) The legal description shall now read as follows:

Commencing 441 feet South of the intersection of the east line of Lot 21, Townsend Subdivision and the southerly line of North Grand River Avenue thence South 840 feet more or less, to the North bank of the Grand River thence northwesterly along said bank to West line of Lot 24, Townsend's Subdivision thence North 180 feet more or less; thence East 57 ft. thence North 545 ft. thence East 284 ft. to a point of beginning. Approximately 5.44 acres.

That, based on the 12,555 square feet in the addition, three more units be allowed for a new total of 69 units, or a density of 12.7 units per acre.

That conditions 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the Council's approval of the revised plan of March 20, 1967, be adhered to.

The arrangement of buildings and facilities shall be as shown on the approved plan.

The addition of the land and units to the plan has the effect of lowering the density of dwelling units from 12.8 (March 20, 1967 approval) to 12.68 units per acre.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nay: None.

SS-1-62

Motion by Black, seconded by Heino, that the request by Morton L. Scholnik, to amend the Lansing Tower Community Unit Plan to allow expansion of the enclosed area on the second floor deck, be approved subject to the following conditions:

That the enclosed area be located as shown on the plan submitted July 19, 1967 and not exceed 3,800 square feet.

That the enclosed area be used only for a lounge and/or recreation space.

That a plan be submitted to and approved by the Building Inspector prior to construction.

All previous conditions of approval shall remain in effect.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

SS-14-67

Mr. Edwin P. Brown, Assistant Planning Director, discussed the South Logan Street Zoning Policy in regard to purpose and objectives of the study, for the benefit of the Board members not previously present at its presentation.

Discussion followed.

A joint meeting of the Planning Board and the Planning Committee of Council was suggested, for discussion of the proposed policy.

Motion by Duncan, seconded by Fink, that SS-14-67 be tabled to a later date to permit further discussion.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

COMMUNICATIONS

RE: S-27-65P

Mr. Guernsey stated that a letter from the Smokler Company dated August 14th was received, which asked for an extension of their previously approved preliminary plat of Georgetown Subdivision located on the south side of Miller Road at Haag Road.

Motion by Duncan, seconded by Black, that a one year extension be approved.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

RE: S-No.-66P Cushion Replat

A letter from Mr. Larry Cushion, dated August 15, 1967 requesting permission to replat a portion of his approved preliminary plat was read to the Board by Mr. Guernsey.

Motion by Black, seconded by Duncan, granting approval for an amendment to the conditions of approval of the preliminary plat of Cushion Replat. This action will allow to plat the remaining property into three lots with the following widths: Lot 5, 50 feet; Lot 6, 55 ft.; Lot 7, 70 ft.; all previous conditions of approval will remain in effect.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

RE: Z-11-67

Mr. Fink read a letter from Mr. Pangle of the City of Lansing Personnel Department in regard to Z-11-67.

Motion by Black, seconded by Heino, that this letter be referred to the Zoning Committee for consideration in their report of Z-11-67 on September 12, 1967.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

SS-12-67

Motion by Black, seconded by Reynolds, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the following amendments to the Zoning Code be adopted:

1. Under Section 36-1 Definition—delete (17) filling stations.
2. Under Section 36-1 Definition—add the following definition:

Auto Service Station is a place where gasoline, or any other automobile engine fuel (stored only in underground tanks), kerosene or motor oil and lubricants or grease (for operation of motor vehicles), are retailed directly to the public, on the premises; including the sale of minor automotive accessories and the servicing of and minor repair of automobiles.

3. Under Section 36-34.1 "E-2" districts permitted uses. Change paragraph (2) from: (2) gas stations to (2) auto service stations.

The Planning Board at their meeting of August 1, 1967 held a public hearing on these amendments. The hearing did not produce any public testimony regarding the proposed zoning amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

NEW BUSINESS

Motion by Black, seconded by Duncan, that Mr. Guernsey be authorized to attend the A.I.P. Conference in Washington, D. C. the first week in October.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Guernsey stated that Mr. Cramton, Community Renewal Coordinator asked that the Board comment at its next meeting on the recently distributed booklet, "Guidelines A Community Renewal Strategy."

Meeting adjourned at 12:42 A.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

T/C

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, September 19, 1967

Meeting called to order at 7:40 P.M. by Chairman Bretz.

Mr. Canady spoke in regard to the urgent need for public housing.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino and Siebert—5.

Absent: Duncan, Fink and Reynolds—3.

Chairman Bretz announced there were no hearings before the Board and asked if any citizens present desired to present matters to the Board.

Mr. Ben Canady, Director of Housing of the inter-Faith Council on religion and race in the Lansing area, spoke in regard to the proposed Turnkey Housing at North Waverly Road. (Z-70-67) He stated his organization supports the proposal and endorses the Board's approval of the proposed housing.

Michael Doyle, attorney, representing approximately 400 families on the northwest portion of the City, stated they are not against Turnkey Housing, rather are opposed to this specific development as it is being considered by the Board. They plan to take the exact same action that was taken on the Jolly-Cedar if this development should be approved. The City Attorney is aware of this. Mr. Doyle suggested using park property to spread this type of housing throughout the City instead of the concentration in one area.

Mr. Black expressed hope that a solution to the housing difficulty can be found other than using public parks as suggested. I have heard a lot of proposals for the use of public parks for one thing or the other. The object of the park system is such that if people start eroding it by this kind of building program whether public housing or whatever, it just does not make sense. I do not sympathize with the suggestion of parks to solve this difficulty.

Mr. Revis, Christo Rey, spoke in favor of the proposal, stating there is definitely a need for this type of housing.

Mr. Jerry Barr, 4638 Stafford Avenue, stated he was in favor of the "scattered" approach in regard to low income housing.

Recess from 8:10 P.M. to 8:46 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Siebert, that the minutes of June 20, 1967, July 11, 1967 and July 18, 1967, be approved.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

HEARING SET

SS-27-67 Proposed Ordinance change for lesser density multiple district.

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend that City Council set a public hearing date at which time the Planning Board would consider amending Chapter 36 of the Code of Ordinance of the City of Lansing, in regard to lesser density multiple district.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

SS-28-67 Proposed Ordinance change for "D-M" District

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend that City Council set a public hearing date at which time the Planning Board would consider amending Chapter 36 of the Code of Ordinance of the City of Lansing, in regard to the "D-M" district.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

SS-29-67 Proposed Ordinance change for Community Unit Plans

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend that City Council set a public hearing date at which time the Planning Board would consider amending Chapter 36, Code of Ordinance

of the City of Lansing, in regard to Community Unit Plans.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

SS-30-67 Amend Central City Plan-Office District

This proposed amendment was referred to the Committee of The Whole, for report at the October 3, 1967 meeting of the Planning Board.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Mrs. Bretz announced that due to the urgency of the two following matters (Z-69-67 and Z-70-67) proxy votes of two members of the Board would be accepted by her under the Board's Rule of Procedures. (Section 3.10)

Z-69-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the application be denied as filed. Based on the Staff's concern over adequate open space including recreation area, and the lack of complimentary play facilities in the area, the Committee recommends that the total number of dwelling units be reduced to eighty (80) by the elimination of the cluster of 4 buildings in the Southeast corner of the site plan. This land is to be added to the recreation area. This rezoning would be accomplished by the Community Unit Plan process and we further recommend that such a rezoning be by ordinance change with the new site plan appended to the ordinance amendment.

1. The Board believes the adjacent area will not be adversely affected by this development.
2. The Board believes the plan is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Zoning Code to promote the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare.
3. That the buildings shall be used only for single-family dwellings, two-family dwellings, or multiple dwellings and the usual accessory uses such as garages, storage space and community activities, including churches.

Mr. Black requested permission to make a statement to explain his vote on both of the subject sites.

Permission granted by Chairman Bretz. Mr. Black's statement is as follows:

"When the Planning Board held a public hearing on these projects I asked Mr. Fine, the promoter-builder, if he thought they could be completed as private rental

developments rather than as "Turn-Key" subsidized housing. He assured the Board that they could and referred to other rental housing projects in the Lansing area with which he is connected as evidence of his knowledge as to the feasibility of such projects in the present market. It would appear, therefore, that if these Community Unit Plans are approved Lansing will be able to count on the addition of approximately 300 units to its housing supply, irrespective of the "Turn-Key" feature.

However, even though the addition of these 300 units would free up an approximately equivalent number of existing units in other areas of the city which could be made available to the Housing Commission, that fact alone apparently does not satisfy the proponents of public housing who insist that these new units must be built for occupancy by a certain specific group of people. The question as to whether the new housing should be private or public, therefore, involves more than simply the physical need for housing. It involves politics, sociology, economics and the whole basic philosophy of the present public housing program.

It used to be that taxes were collected primarily for national defense and to pay for the administration of a relatively simple form of government. Today, however, a large share of our tax dollar is levied specifically for the purpose of taking money away from those who have it and giving it, under one form of public welfare program or another, to those who haven't. Public housing is an example of this process in action.

Furthermore, the present administrators of the program have stated quite frankly that in the matter of site selection they intend to use the program as an instrument of social reform. To implement this aspect they insist that sites shall be distributed as evenly as possible throughout the urban community regardless of whether the present residents of the area want them or not. And the propaganda they are using in support of their position is geared to make it appear that anyone who opposes them is automatically opposed to integration and opposed to decent housing for the poor. For some reason they apparently choose to overlook the fact that the program itself is simply a continuation and re-affirmation of the principle of segregation-but in a different location.

It seems odd that a government which is trying to erase lines of distinction between people of various races and economic classes and to provide equality of opportunity in all things for all people should, at the same time, promote a housing policy which forces together, in one place, a group of people whose social and economic position in the community is thereby automatically advertised as sub-standard. That, it seems to me, is discrimination in reverse and against the very people the program is supposed to help. It says, in effect, that segregation and discrimination are all

right if they occur in a physically acceptable environment.

It should be obvious to anyone that if social reform is the underlying motivation of the public housing program then present policies will not produce the results desired. The best way to begin true social reform in Lansing would be for us to approve Mr. Fine's Unit Plans on both these sites and for him to proceed with their construction as commercial rental developments with the proviso that a certain number of units (not to exceed, say 5% of the total) be made available to the Housing Commission for subsidized rental tenants and with the further proviso that none of these subsidized units could be contiguous to one another in the development.

A similar provision if applied to all future developments authorized under Community Unit Zoning would eventually solve both the social and physical needs aspect of the program without the necessity for constructing public housing as such and without the community antagonisms and resentments which inevitably accompany attempts to implement the present program. Furthermore, and by far the most important, this method would not require those unfortunate people who must depend on public assistance to live in a place where their misfortune would be a matter of common knowledge. Human dignity, which should be an essential part of any meaningful social reform program, might thus be promoted instead of destroyed.

However, since the City of Lansing has officially committed itself to the present form of segregated public housing it would seem that about the only thing the Planning Board can do is to screen proposed sites so that they are confined to those areas of the city where they will not inhibit the future development of potentially high-tax-base vacant land. Since public housing and all other tax-supported welfare programs depend on the preservation of a healthy tax base for their implementation and operation, the use of high-tax potential land for public housing just doesn't make sense. The administrators of public welfare programs should be the first to recognize this fact in their own self interest and in the long term interest of the people they serve.

In my opinion the proposed Waverly site is potentially high-tax base vacant land and should not be considered as a site for public housing. The Turner Street site, on the other hand, does not have a similar potential and might be acceptable if the city insists on proceeding with the present program, however, even if the Turner Street site is approved, I would also like to suggest that the Code Enforcement Section of the Lansing Building Department and the Housing Commission jointly select a four to eight block area of Lansing's worst housing and make a study of the probable cost of a concentrated program of rehabilitation or replacement in that area

of the city. If we are to have segregated housing under the program in any case, it should be possible, with a little imagination, to create an acceptable physical environment in the Central City as well as in the suburbs. I personally would like to see a central core project proceed simultaneously with Mr. Fine's Turner Street Project and with a community unit development of the Waverly site with 5% of the units earmarked for rental subsidy tenants. Then, as a result of our experience with all three types of projects we would be in a much better position to chart the future course of Lansing's housing program."

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino and Siebert—5.

Yea by Proxy: Fink and Reynolds—2.

Nays: None.

Z-70-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the application be denied as filed. In lieu thereof the Committee recommends that the portion of this site that would lie North of Wilson Street extended to Waverly Road be conventional as opposed to "Turn-Key" housing integrating with the Community Unit Plan recently recommended immediately to the East of this property. The land lying to the South of the said Wilson Street extended, the Committee recommends be retained for single family development.

1. The Board believes the adjacent area will not be adversely affected by this development.
2. The Board believes the plan is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Zoning Code to promote the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare.
3. That the buildings shall be used only for single-family dwellings, two family dwellings, or multiple family dwellings and the usual accessory uses such as garages, storage space and community activities, including churches.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Heino, Gaus and Siebert—5.

Nays by proxy: Fink and Reynolds—2.

Mr. Black asked for a clarification of the vote, stating that the vote was not on "Turn-Key" housing but on the above Committee recommendation. The proposal before us is to approve the property for a

Community Unit Plan for a "Turn-Key" housing project. The Committee recommended against that and as a substitute offered the proposal for conventional housing and single family housing. That is the motion defeated. Have we actually voted on the matter of "Turn-Key"?

Mr. Guernsey stated that the first part of the motion denied the "Turn-Key" housing.

Further discussion followed.

Motion by Black to reconsider the vote.

Motion lost for lack of a second.

COMMUNITY SHELTER PROGRAM

Mr. Guernsey introduced Mr. Ronald Gierthy of the Planning Department Staff, who spoke in regard to the Community Shelter Program. Mr. Gierthy stated the purpose of the program is to determine the location of the closest shelter available to residents, and the end product will be a map which will be sent to the families in Lansing showing the closest shelter location. This is not a bomb shelter location, but fallout shelters. The first step in the program is a survey by the Corps of Engineers of the buildings within Lansing that are possible fallout shelter locations. Mr. Gierthy used maps to illustrate the shelters in the central business districts, shelter deficiency areas, and shelter surplus areas, the day and night time population in the central business district in order to plan for the capacity of shelters in the central business district, and other factors involved in the determination of the need and location of the shelters.

Discussion followed.

COMMUNITY RENEWAL PROGRAM

Mr. Guernsey introduced Mr. Martin Cramton, Community Renewal Coordinator. Mr. Cramton stated the Lansing Community Renewal Program was originated in 1965.

It is a federal aid planning program for urban renewal. Maps were presented showing the areas of physical deterioration in the City of Lansing and the concentration

of social blight. There is a direct correlation between the areas of social and physical blight. Mr. Cramton emphasized the importance of taking steps now to prevent further blight. He explained the three basic approaches using urban renewal to rectify the blighted areas. They are: (1) gradual redevelopment approach; (2) large scale clearance approach; and (3) comprehensive development program approach. Mr. Cramton elaborated on the pros and cons of each approach concluding that the third approach where urban renewal is used as a creative catalyst the most desired approach.

Discussion followed.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Guernsey discussed with the Board that Staff time and other commitments from the Shelter Program be channeled to the consultation budget of the Board for continuation of the contract with Vilecan Leman zoning ordinance consultants, in order for the zoning work to be completed.

Mr. Gaus suggested an unbiased review by the Planning Board, of the proposed ordinance.

Matter referred to Committee of The Whole.

NEW BUSINESS

SS-25-67

Ronald Nino, Planning Department, described the proposed policy plan for planned unit developments. He cited the policy goals and the submissions required to effectuate the goals.

The Board questioned the word detailed, in regard to detailed site plans proposed for submission.

Matter was referred to Committee of The Whole.

Meeting adjourned at 11:37 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, September 12, 1967

Meeting called to order by Chairman Bretz at 7:40 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Absent: Duncan—1.

HEARINGS

Z-104-67 300-318 Seymour Street

Mr. William Bechtel planner discussed the location, size of the property, present zoning in the area, and the generalized land use in the area of the proposed development, which is 103 dwelling units for the elderly.

Mr. Richard Zimmerman, Redevelopment Director of the City of Lansing, stated that in the original Urban Renewal plan this site was designated for the proposed type of use. The project would be financed through government bonds, and would be limited to the elderly on an income basis.

Mr. Fink questioned the feasibility of the project if this land were made available to a non-profit group such as some other projects now being proposed in the City.

Mr. Gaus questioned the bearing this development would have on the Roosevelt elderly and Mr. Elliott Housing Director for the City of Lansing, replied that the hotel housing would be for moderate income and this project is for low income.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-106-67 2700 and 3300 Block E. Jolly Road

William Bechtel, planner, discussed the location, size of the property, land development in the area, and an explanation of the proposed project.

Mr. Donald Hogan, architect for the proposed project, stated there were 130 acres in the total project of which 15 acres would be developed for commercial use and the remaining 115 acres would be developed with apartment use with school, park, and church sites included. 1,380 units proposed with parking at a ratio of 2 to 1. Mr. Hogan pointed out the highlights of the proposed development.

Mr. Joe Pentecost stated that he owned the 9 acres adjacent to the proposed development. He asked if his property could be included in this rezoning in order to coordinate his development with the one proposed. He stated this proposition had not been discussed with the developers of the proposed project.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-99-67

Mr. Leo Farhat, attorney, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 3337 and 3345 S. Washington Avenue at Holmes Road, from "A" one, "F", and "J" to "E-2" drive-in district.

Mr. Farhat presented a site plan and photos of the proposed Pure Oil Service Station. He stated the land use in the surrounding area, and gave a detailed description of the proposal.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-103-67

Mr. Thomas Gallie, petitioner, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at the 6600 block of South Aurelius Road, from "A" one family to "C-2" family district.

Mr. Gallie stated that the subject property has access to a major artery and that it contains more than enough square footage than required. A 17 ft. right-of-way was dedicated to the City at the time of purchase of the land. Also stated that since zoning other than "A" one family

now exists in the area he could see no reason why "C-2" family would not be desirable.

Mr. Gaus asked how many units he proposed on the property and Mr. Gallie replied there would be one unit per lot and that he would be residing on the property himself.

Mr. Fink asked about the availability of sewers and Mr. Gallie replied there are no sewers at the present time, but that he had permission from the Ingham County Health Department to install a septic tank.

Further discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-107-67

Mr. Sam Clay appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 212 W. Mt. Hope Avenue, from "D-M" family to "F" commercial district.

Mr. Clay stated that the subject property had been utilized as a commercial site for over 20 years, and in 1963 a building permit was issued for expansion of the commercial use at that time.

Mr. Reynolds asked if the building on the property was empty now, and Mr. Clay replied that it has been leased, that he took the building in on trade and was given to understand that it was commercial property.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-108-67

A letter requesting withdrawal of the petition to rezone property at the 2900 block of Ruth Street and the 2900 block of Aurelius Road from "A" one family to "D-I" professional office district was received and placed on file.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-109-67

Mr. Stan Stelmashenko, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 700-702 W. Willow Street, from "B-1" family to "C-2" family and "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Mr. Stelmashenko stated that he proposed to build a 12 unit apartment dwelling, and that the property is large enough to build 20 units. One house on the property would be torn down. He presented

plans of the proposed unit, stating there would be three parking spaces per unit.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-110-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at the 200 block of S. Fairview Street, from "B-1" family to "C-2" family district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-111-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 926 Cleo Street, from "A" one family to "C-2" family district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-112-67

Mr. Leo Farhat, attorney, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 1021 Moores River Drive, from "B-1" family to "D-1" professional office district.

Mr. Farhat stated that the petitioner wishes to demolish and remove the existing structure and construct a new building, which would face Logan St. There would be adequate parking for three or four employees. He commented on zoning in the immediate area of the proposal.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-113-67

Mr. Lynn Sible, petitioner, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 1309 E. Grand River, from "C-2" family to "H" light industrial district.

Mr. Sible stated he proposed to construct an auto parts store.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-114-67

Mr. H. J. Scherer, petitioner, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone prop-

erty at 2200 S. Cedar Street, from "C-2" family to "J" parking district.

Mr. Scherer stated he wished to make parking space for employees and customers cars. The subject property runs from Riley Street to Maplewood School and measures approximately 65 ft. by 130 ft.

No one appeared in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-115-67

Ted Glowace, 522 Maple Hill, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 605 S. Holmes Street, from "B-1" family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Mr. Glowace stated that this is a deteriorating neighborhood, and the proposed multiple dwelling would improve the area.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-116-67

Mr. Karl Kessler, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 1325 E. Jolly Road, from "A" one family to "H" light industrial district.

Mr. Kessler stated that zoning in the area is "H" light industrial to the north and east, and residential to the south and west. He does not believe this area is fit for residential use.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-117-67

Mr. James R. Duncan, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property on Orchard Court, from "C-2" family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Mr. Duncan presented to the Board a fact sheet regarding sanitary sewers, storm drain, parking, and other factors regarding the proposed development. He commented in regard to the land use in the surrounding area.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-118-67

Reverend Jenkins, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 2208 N. Grand River Avenue, from "A" one family to "B-1" family district.

Reverend Jenkins stated the property directly north which consists of 8 thousand feet had been offered to them, and also another property has been offered which could be used for parking. Reverend Jenkins showed the Board pictures of the proposed church.

Mr. Fink asked the seating capacity of the proposed church, and Reverend Jenkins replied one hundred and twenty persons.

Discussion followed in regard to parking requirements.

No one appeared in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-119-67

Robert Mermelstein, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 5814 S. Pennsylvania Avenue, from "J" parking to "F" commercial district.

Mr. Mermelstein stated they need the rezoning for a sign which they feel is necessary to conduct their business. It would be in good taste.

Mr. Reynolds asked if other commercial places on Pennsylvania have signs and Mr. Mermelstein replied in the affirmative.

No one appeared in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-120-67

Mr. Don Hines, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 1000 W. Dunlap Street, from "A" one family to "J" parking district.

Mr. Hines stated that he was also speaking in regard to petition No. Z-125-67 which is all a part of the same request by the drop forge. Mr. Hines stated that the forge has been in operation for some 14 years. At that time the property was in the township, and upon annexation it automatically reverted to "A" one family property. The operators of the establishment did not realize this at that time, and as a result they operated under an "A" one classification. Last December a request for a building permit was issued, which should not have been done. Now it is desired to erect an addition to the building

and when a building permit was applied for this time it was discovered the property was "A" one. Petitioners ask that the property be returned to zoning classification according to its nature of operation which is "I" heavy industrial.

Discussion followed.

No one appeared in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-122-67

Mr. James Hovey, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 2122 N. Logan Street, from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Mr. Hovey presented sketches and pictures to the Board showing the adjacent properties and the zonings which surround the subject property. The subject property is under the same ownership as the property to the south for which a Community Unit Plan has been approved. A summary sheet was also presented pointing out the surrounding uses; the allowable density; storm and sanitary sewer facilities; access to the property. Mr. Hovey stated that the developers involved would be glad to amend the present Community Unit proposal at the south to include this property, provided that the desired density be obtained so that this proposal would be a commercially feasible operation.

Discussion followed in regard to the economic factor mentioned by Mr. Hovey.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

RE: Z-100-67

Mr. Guernsey announced that the public hearing for the proposed Community Unit Plan by Mr. John Bean, located in the 3500 block of Pleasant Grove Road, would be tabled at the request of Mr. Bean to allow the architect to submit plans at which time another hearing date will be set.

Mr. Anthony P. Nosal addressed the Board in regard to a previous experience before the Board, the fact that he was present in regard to Z-100-67 the proposed Community Unit Plan noted above, the methods employed by the Planning Staff in regard to rezoning application. He referred to his rezoning petition No. Z-185-65 which is currently in the Court of Appeals.

RE: Z-214-65

Mr. Richard Hendra, 3805 Cooley Drive, presented a communication from about 75% of the residents on Cooley Drive opposing the subject rezoning pending before the Board.

Communication received and placed on file.

Mr. William McCurdy, owner of the subject property stated that the majority of property owners in McCurdy Acres No. 1 were not in opposition to the proposed development.

Mr. Mulder of Gert Mulder and Sons, spoke in defense of the proposed development, stating it would not detract in any way from the area.

Mr. William Demeritt, 3500 Cooley Drive, commented in regard to the traffic situation at the corner of Moores River Drive and Waverly Road, and that there were signatures on the petition in opposition to the proposed development who resided in McCurdy Acres.

Recess from 10:00 P.M. to 11:11 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Black, seconded by Reynolds that the minutes of June 6, 1967 be approved.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-214-65

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the Community Unit Plan, at 3831 Moores River Drive, be approved subject to conditions, on the basis that past decisions in this area have already committed this site to Community Unit Plan development.

Mr. Black expressed his regret that he must vote no on the above recommendation. Access to the subject property from the corner of Moores River Drive and Waverly is an impossible situation for the number of people. It is too bad property was not a part of Beneficke and Krue development so it could have had access from their road system, instead of from one of the worst intersections in town.

Mr. Fink asked if the access and egress of the proposed development would be directly from the intersection of Waverly and Moores River Drive?

Mr. Guernsey replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Fink asked if there was any other possibility of ingress or egress to the site? Mr. Bechtel replied this had been discussed with the developers of the Benecke and Krue project, and they were not desirous of having a connection between the two projects. No feasible way to work this out unless the developers decide to agree on this.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Heino and Siebert—3.

Nay: Black, Fink, Gaus and Reynolds—4.

Z-11-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board again recommend denial of the petition to rezone property at 403 N. Sycamore Street and 712 W. Shiawassee Street, from "D-M" multiple dwelling district to "D-1" professional office district which petition was referred by the City Council on May 16, 1967 to the Planning Board.

The property is outside the area designated as "D-1" professional district as determined by the Central City Master Plan, and the Board could find no basic reason or justification to alter the policy approach of the Plan.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nay: None.

Z-69-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the petition to rezone property at 3100-3200 blocks of Turner Street, to Community Unit Plan be tabled to September 19, 1967 meeting of the Board for further study.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-70-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the petition to rezone property at 3000 to 3500 blocks N. Waverly to Community Unit Plan be tabled to September 19, 1967 meeting of the Board for further study.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-84-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the petition to rezone property at the

southwest corner of Main Street and Birch Street, from "B-1" family to "E-2" drive-in district be tabled until the October 3, 1967 meeting of the Planning Board to allow the applicant an opportunity to present additional information.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-85-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the petition to rezone property at 602 Woodbury Avenue, from "C-2" family to "F" commercial district be denied without prejudice and further request Building Inspection of the property with a report to the Planning Staff.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nay: None.

Z-90-67

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the petition to rezone property at 2816 S. Washington Avenue, from "A" one residential to "D-1" professional office district be tabled until the September 19, 1967 meeting of the Planning Board.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-93-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Frank Clark, to rezone a parcel at 1100 block Victor Avenue, from "B-1" family residential to "H" high industrial district be denied as filed, and the property be zoned "F" commercial.

The Staff believes that this will allow reasonable use of the land allowing relocation of the existing business, and at the same time provide a proper transition between the existing residential, and proposed warehouse development.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nay: None.

Z-94-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to

City Council that the petition by Ethel M. Trayer, to rezone a parcel at 245 Mosley Avenue, from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied.

The Board is of the opinion that this area is substantially a stable single family area, and the Master Plan recommends the retention of this type of low density residential use in this area.

In the event the Lot were rezoned to "D-M" this would allow more than simply a conversion of the residence and this would not be desirable in view of the fact that the Lot is only forty-two feet wide.

Rezoning this land for "D-M" would require equal consideration to all other property owners in the area and this may in the future require extensive rebuilding of public services to handle the new increased density environment.

Unrestricted conversion of single family homes as would be permitted by "D-M" zoning could adversely affect the area and hasten its physical deterioration contrary to community renewal efforts.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-95-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Harold L. Placer, to rezone a parcel on Richmond Street described as:

Lot No. 7 Placer Subdivision

from "A" one residential to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied as filed, and that consideration be given under Section 36-7 of the Zoning Ordinance (Community Unit Plan) at a density of 12 dwelling units per acre.

The change would be contrary to the existing and potential land use development of this area.

The basic land use conditions have not changed in this area that would justify a change as requested.

It is the policy of the Planning Board to recommend development in a 12 dwelling per acre in this vicinity.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-96-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Charles K. Krillis and Nicholas J. Bardaville, to rezone a parcel at 5000 N. Grand River Avenue, from "A" one family residential to "F" commercial, "J" parking, "D-1" professional and "D-M" multiple district be denied, and the petitioners submit a Community Unit Plan.

The Committee finds that the subject property is ideally suited for a Community Unit Plan if designed with the following features:

Reverse frontage development along North Grand River Avenue.

A diversity of building type and density with the highest density along N. Grand River Avenue and lowest at the south boundary.

A street pattern which is integrated with adjacent developments.

The property should be platted to provide for orderly development and proper dedication of streets.

Further recommends that platting of the entire area be in conformance with long range plans, which takes into consideration all the land in the area.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-97-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Reynolds, that the petition by Gasper Covello, to rezone a parcel at 4816 S. Logan Street, from "J" parking to "F" commercial district be granted.

The rezoning would facilitate the operation and expansion of the owners business.

There is adequate land available for expansion of off-street parking if this request is approved.

Ingress, egress, and off-street parking arrangement should be worked out with the City Traffic Engineer for the entire commercial complex. Limit Logan Street entrance to egress only and provide for ingress and egress entrance on Pierce Road. A right turn just before regular intersections should be discouraged for safety reasons.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-98-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by John Fessenden, to rezone a parcel at 5303 South Logan, from residential non-conforming to commercial district be denied as filed, and the property be zoned "E-2" drive-in shop.

The basic land use and zoning conditions in the immediate vicinity have changed.

There is no proposal to change the existing service station use, therefore, it can be assumed that a change of zoning to "E-2" drive-in will not have any adverse effect on adjacent properties.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-125-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Donald A. Hines, acting for Federal Drop Forge Company, to rezone a parcel at 2807 S. Logan Street described as:

Lots 37, 38 and 39 of Logancrest Subdivision located on part of Sections 28 and 29, T4N, R2W, Lansing Twp., Ingham County, Michigan, and the North $\frac{1}{2}$ of the N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ except the West 330 feet thereof, on Section 29, T4N, R2W, Lansing Twp., Ingham Co., Michigan

from "A" one family to "I" heavy industrial district be denied as filed, and that

Lots 37 and 38 of Logancrest Subdivision and the South 30 feet of the N. $\frac{1}{2}$ of the N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ except the West 330 feet thereof

be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking, and that

The North $\frac{1}{2}$ of the N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ except the S. 30 ft. and the West 330 feet thereof, of Section 29, T4N, R2W, Ingham Co., Michigan

be rezoned "I" heavy industrial. Screening to be provided along the West line of said Lot 38 except the residential setback; the East line of said Lot 37, except the residential setback; and along a line described as beginning at the N.W. corner of Lot 36 thence East to a point of ending in the center of Atlas Avenue.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-101-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Lee Halstead, to rezone a parcel in the 5500 block South Logan Street described as:

Lots 113 thru 126 and 131 thru 149 of Village Green Subdivision

from "A" residential to "C-2" family district be denied as filed, and that

Lots 132 to 149 inclusive

be zoned "C-2" family, and the

balance of the property

remain in its present zoning classification.

The Committee believes that a change of zoning on the Lots South of Mel Avenue, would over expose the balance of the proposed single development, to additional traffic and activity that would be created with the increased density.

The properties in question have ease of access to a major street (Logan Street).

School and sewer facilities are capable of handling the increased density.

The Consumers Power Company R.O.W. adjacent to the North lots is proposed to be developed for recreational purposes.

The lots proposed for two-family zoning are more than double the area required by the present code for two family zoning

(4000 vs. 8200) and 1700 square feet larger than the Planning Board's recommendation for two family lots.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following votes:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nay: None.

Z-102-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Lee M. Halstead, to rezone a parcel at the North side of Malibu Drive—Bradley Hill Subdivision described as:

Lot 1 thru 10, and 31, 32, 33, 34 of Bradley Hills

from "A" residential to "C-2" family district be denied as filed, and that

Lots 1 to 5 inclusive, and metes and bounds parcel West and adjacent to Lot 1

be zoned "C-2" family, and the

balance of the request

remain in its present zoning classification.

The Committee believes that a change of zoning on the lots South of Malibu Drive would be a direct encroachment into the remaining single family area.

The properties in question have ease of access to a major street (Waverly Road).

School and sewer facilities are capable of handling the increased density.

Averill Park is located immediately East of the subject property.

The request change would provide a proper transitional use between the apartment development now under construction to the North, and the proposed single family development to the South.

The lots proposed for two family zoning contain more than 1½ the area required by the present code for two family zoning (4000 sq. ft. vs. 7400 sq. ft.), and 800 sq. ft. larger than the Planning Boards recommendation for two family lots.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nay: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

S-9-67P Southland Plaza, Preliminary Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the preliminary plat of Southland Plaza be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Final Plat to be developed with public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and Lansing Sub-division Regulations.
2. Construction and improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior to approval of the final plat.
3. All required easements should be shown on the face of the final plat.
4. Street right-of-way should be 66 feet with a 36 foot pavement. A right dedication of 50 feet along Easterly line of the plat for S. Washington Avenue and a dedication of 60 feet for Holmes Road should be provided.
5. All lots should be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.
6. The existing 50 foot Hector drain easement should be shown on the face of the plat.
7. The land to be occupied by the Department Store should be included within the plat as a numbered lot.
8. This approval shall expire September 12, 1968.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nay: None.

ROW-10-67

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the request to vacate a twenty foot alley located between W. Mt. Hope Avenue and Cooper Street, West of Boston Boulevard be approved, subject to the retention of the City of a public utility easement and the approval of the City Attorney.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nay: None.

ROW-11-67

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus, that the request to vacate an alley (10 ft. x 132 ft.) extending South from Oak Street

between Ohio and Indiana Avenue, be tabled to the October 3, 1967 meeting of the Planning Board in order to notify the adjacent property owners of the request.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

SS-23-67

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that they set a public hearing date at which time the Planning Board would consider an amendment to Chapter 36 of the Code of Ordinance of the City of Lansing.

The present zoning code in respect of Section 36-15 refers to "Amending, supplementing, changing or modifying district boundaries or regulations." It is the opinion of the Board that a petition for re-zoning would be substantially expedited if the petitioner would submit adequate information and exhibits documenting his request. In order to accomplish this we would have to investigate the desirability of making certain changes to the petition form and to the code with respect to Section 36-15. The following is herefore proposed:

1. That the petition form hereto attached replace the existing form.
2. That Section 36-15 be amended by adding the following thereto:

"Said application is available from the City Clerk's office and shall be completed in the manner described therein. In addition to said application, the applicant shall submit a site plan which accurately describes the existing and future physical relationship of the building(s) to each other and with respect to all property lines on which the same is/are situated. Other exhibits are to be submitted as required by the Planning Board."

The Planning Board suggests that this public hearing be set for the Board by City Council for Tuesday, October 17, 1967 at 7:30 P.M. in Court Room No. 1, Sixth Floor, City Hall.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

SS-17-67 and SS-18-67

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the following amendments to the Zoning Code be adopted:

The deletion of the following section from the "D" apartment district of the Zoning Code:

"Section 36-26 (2) Funeral homes, hospitals and clinics, excepting veterinary hospitals and clinics."

Sections 36-26 (3) and 36-26 (4) would be renumbered to 36-26 (2) and 36-26 (3) if the above amendment is approved.

The Addition of the following section to be numbered Section 36-29 (8) in the "D-1" professional office district.

"Section 36-29 (8) Funeral Homes, Hospitals and clinics, excepting veterinary hospitals and clinics."

The Planning Board at their meeting of August 15, 1967 held a public hearing on these amendments. The hearing did not produce any public testimony regarding the proposed zoning amendments.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that Mrs. Bretz be appointed as the Planning Board representative to the Metropolitan Fine Arts Council.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that Mr. Fink be appointed as the Planning Board representative to the Community Services Council.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Meeting adjourned at 12:13 A.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

B/C

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Special Meeting, September 26, 1967

Meeting called to order at 7:52 P.M. by Chairman Ramona Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Absent: Heino—1.

Mrs. Bretz, announced that the express purpose of the special meeting was to reconsider the proposed Community Unit Plan, namely Z-69-67 block of Turner Street and Z-70-67 3000-3500 blocks Waverly Road. Proxy votes on these two matters were considered at the September 19, 1967 meeting of the Planning Board. However, the City Attorney ruled that the proxy votes were not acceptable.

Mr. Black asked that the Zoning Committee Chairman read the recommendation on the proposed projects and remarks be confined to the report of the Committee.

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Black, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the application be denied as filed. Based on the Staff's concern over adequate open space including recreation area, and the lack of complimentary play facilities in the area, the Committee recommends that the total number of dwelling units be reduced to eighty (80) by the elimination of the cluster of 4 buildings in the Southeast corner of the site plan. This land is to be added to the recreation area. This rezoning would be accomplished by the Community Unit Plan process and we further recommend that such a rezoning be by ordinance change with the new site plan appended as an ordinance amendment.

1. The Committee believes the adjacent area will not adversely be affected by this development.
2. The Committee believes the plan is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Zoning Code to promote the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare.
3. That the buildings shall be used only for single family dwellings, two family dwellings or multiple dwellings and the

usual accessory uses such as garages, storage space and community activities, including churches.

Motion by Duncan to amend the above Committee motion to return the number of dwelling units to 100, because of the acute housing shortage within the City of Lansing.

Motion lost for lack of a second.

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Gaus, to amend the Committee recommendation from 100 units to 95 units. This is the elimination of one unit to provide more open space in the project.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yea: Duncan, Fink, Gaus, and Reynolds—4.

Nay: Black, Bretz and Siebert—3.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus, that the rules be suspended to allow the developer of the proposed project Mr. Fine, to speak.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nay: Black—1.

Mr. Fine stated that 80 units would mean \$600 per unit increase in cost, which the federal government has indicated they would not approve unless park area can be purchased by the City. I think 80 units would not be economically feasible, and perhaps there would not be a program.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Reynolds, that the matter be tabled two weeks to allow clearance of the project by other units of city government at which time the developer would again be contacted to review what has taken place.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Duncan, Fink and Reynolds—4.

Nay: Black, Gaus and Siebert—3.

The following vote applies to the original motion by Siebert, seconded by Black, that the petition to deny as filed, etc.

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nay: None.

Z-70-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Black, that the application be denied as filed. In lieu thereof the Committee recommends that the portion of this site that would lie North of Wilson Street extended to Waverly Road be conventional as opposed to "Turn-Key" housing integrated with the Community Unit Plan recently recommended immediately to the East of this property. The land lying to the South of the said Wilson Street extended, the Committee recommends it be retained for single family development.

1. The Committee believes the adjacent area will not be adversely affected by this development.
2. The Committee believes the plan is consistent with the intent and purpose of the Zoning Code to promote the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare.
3. That the buildings shall be used only for single family dwellings, two family dwellings, or multiple family dwellings and the usual accessory uses such as garages, storage space and community activities, including churches.

Mr. Michael Doyle, 3028 E. LaFayette Circle, asked for explanation of the amendment of the above recommendation in regard to conventional housing.

Planning Department Staff, pointed out on the plan, the location of the proposed conventional housing.

Mr. Guernsey explained that the conventional housing recommended, means Community Unit Plan of 12 units per acre.

Discussion followed.

Mr. Francis Fine, developer, apologized for his having to leave the meeting early. He stated as he understood the recommendation. If this property could be rezoned for 12 units per acre it would be far more profitable than "Turn-Key," however it would be a shame for the community. I suggested a compromise of 100 elderly units 50 family units and the balance of the land be considered for conventional

housing. In our plan we have a fairly low density. Hoped that the Board would reconsider their recommendation.

Mr. Canady, Interfaith Council on religion and race spoke in favor of the proposed housing.

Mr. Marcel Elliott, Director of Housing for the City of Lansing, spoke in regard to the need for the proposed type of housing in this City.

Carolyn Schuurmans, 2620 Wilson Avenue, spoke in favor of the proposed amendment.

Anthony Nosal spoke in regard to the calling of special meetings; commended the Board for their recommendation, and commented on previous rezoning petitions presented to the Board.

Reverend George Grettenberger, Office of Economic Opportunity, spoke of the proposed amendment.

Charles Woodruff, 3708 Delta River Drive, spoke in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Motion by Duncan, that the Committee recommendation be amended to consider the original project proposed which called for 100 elderly units and 100 units for low income housing.

Motion lost for lack of a second.

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Fink, that the Committee recommendation be amended to 150 units to consist of 100 elderly and 50 family units with the balance of the property to be developed under Community Unit Plan at a density to be determined by the Board at a later date.

Discussion followed.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yea: Duncan, Fink and Reynolds—3.

Nay: Black, Bretz, Gaus and Siebert—4.

Motion by Duncan, seconded by Gaus, that the total number of 100 units, 50 elderly, and 50 low income be located on the site originally planned for the 100 elderly units, with a park site North of Wilson Street extended.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yea: Duncan, Fink, Gaus and Reynolds—4.

Nay: Black, Bretz and Siebert—3.

The following vote applies to the original recommendation by Siebert, seconded by Black, that the application be denied as filed, etc.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Gaus and Siebert
—4.

Nays: Duncan, Fink and Reynolds—3.

Meeting adjourned at 9:15 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, October 3, 1967

Meeting called to order at 7:36 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Absent: Black and Heino—2.

Mr. Fink commented that the townhouse type structure is more compatible in a residential area.

Discussion followed.

Several property owners were present in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

HEARINGS

Z-199-65

Mr. Plumhoff, petitioner, appeared in regard to the petition to revise the formerly approved Community Unit Plan, at 1400-1500 Marquette Street.

Mrs. Collins, 1500 Windsor Street, asked for a clarification of the proposed revision.

Mr. Bechtel, of the Planning Department Staff, explained that the request is to change the formerly approved plan to allow two buildings of six townhouses each, rather than the former plan for one building with twelve apartment units. Parking will be at a ratio of 2.0 spaces per unit. The site has 1.35 acres, and the density will be about 8.2 units per acre.

Mr. Carl Tobey, of 3104 Mildred, referred to a petition signed in opposition to this type of development about a year ago, and asked if the petition was ignored?

Mrs. Bretz answered that the property was rezoned for apartment use, and explained that final action is taken by City Council.

Z-26-67

Mr. Chris Baryames, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 600 S. Logan Street, from "E-2" drive-in to "F" commercial district.

The Staff was instructed to check on the proposed land use of the property.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-123-67

Mr. Don Berger, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 3717 S. Pennsylvania Avenue, from "J" parking to "G-2" wholesale district.

Mr. Berger explained the necessity of the proposed rezoning stating that in January he was granted the "G-2" zoning for the subject property. In proceeding with the preliminary drawings of the architect for a combination warehouse office complex, he found that the land structure and land fill did not make it advisable to place the buildings on the North side of

the property. We propose to place the warehouse structure on the South side of the property. In doing so he lost about 6,000 square feet of warehouse area. The office area will be in the area that is now zoned "J" parking. Therefore, he is requesting the additional "G-2" zoning to allow the placement of this building.

Discussion followed.

No one appeared in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-126-67

Mr. David Kirkey, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 4909 South Logan Street, from "A" one family to "E-2" drive-in district.

Mr. Kirkey stated he is a salesman for the property. A new type of drive-thru car wash is proposed for the site, the size of which is 25 ft. by 50 ft. Mr. Kirkey commented on the land use in the area.

No one appeared in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

ROW-11-67

This is a request to vacate an alley (10 x 132 ft.) extending South from Oak Street between Ohio and Indiana Avenue.

Mr. Bill Lawrence, 1414 Oak Street, one of the petitioners for the alley vacation stated that the reason for the request is that the alley is not being taken care of by the City. No improvements in seven years. Wants to have it vacated by the City in order to gravel it and eventually blacktop it.

Howard Berg, 1412 Ohio Avenue, stated he needs the alley open. He spoke in opposition to closing the alley.

Mr. McCaleb, 1411 Indiana Avenue, spoke in opposition to the closing of the alley.

Floyd Martin, 1422 Ohio Street, spoke in regard to the City taking care of the alley.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

RE: Z-84-67

Morgan Carter, 824 Birch Street, spoke in opposition to the proposed rezoning at 1301, 1305, 1309 and 1311 W. Main Street,

from "B-1" family to "E-2" drive-in district.

Mr. James Hovey, attorney representing petitioners in this matter, presented to the Board a summary sheet on the subject property concerning present use, future growth in the area, public utilities, and displacement of residences. Attached to the summary was a sketch of the site, and a map of the area and the proposed street development in the area.

Discussion followed.

Recess from 8:50 to 9:22 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

Z-90-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the petition to rezone property at 2816 S. Washington Avenue, from "A" one residential to "D-1" professional office district be denied and the property be rezoned "C-2" family.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Duncan, that the rules be suspended to allow the petitioner of the subject property to address the Board.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Dunham, petitioner, stated that the only reason he is asking for the zoning is for his office. Only a small identification sign would be necessary.

Discussion followed.

Motion to deny and rezone property to "C-2" family failed by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Siebert—4.

Nays: Fink and Reynolds—2.

Z-118-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the petition to rezone the property at 2208 N. Grand River, from "A" one family district to "B-1" family district be denied.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—5.

Nays: Duncan—1.

Z-200-65

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board advise City Coun-

cil of the revisions in the Community Unit Plan by Smokler Company for the property at Miller Road and Haag Road described as:

E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ and W. $\frac{1}{2}$ of N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ N. of N. R/W line I-96 exc. com. 757.25 ft. E. of N. $\frac{1}{8}$ post N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$, the E. 220 ft. S. 394 ft. W. 220 ft. N. 394 ft. to beg.; Section 8, T3N, R2W

The Board approved the plan in 1966 subject to several recommendations. Revisions in the plan in accord with the Board's recommendations have now been submitted and approved with the exception of the parcels indicated for school and city park uses. Final approval of the plan is being reserved pending the satisfactory resolution of these properties to the satisfaction of the respective Boards involved.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-39-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Joseph Messette, to rezone a parcel at the S.E. corner of W. Miller Road and Grovenburg described as:

W. 231 ft. of the N. 565 ft. of N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ excluding N. 231 ft. of East 100 ft. Section 8, T3N, R2W

from "A" one residential to "D-1" professional district be denied.

This site was considered by the Planning Board in July of 1965 from "D-M" multiple, and again in September 1965 for "C-2" family, in both cases the requests were denied for the following reasons:

The site does not meet the general criteria for outlying apartment development adopted by the Planning Board.

The Master Plan recommendations suggest low-density residential development of this area.

Existing zoning and development in the vicinity of the site is single family.

Existing sewers are not constructed to handle high density development.

School facilities are inadequate to accommodate the proposed change.

Platting should proceed any development of the land.

The City Council concurred in the recommendation of the Planning Board.

The Committee does not believe that conditions have changed that would justify the change as requested at this time.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-84-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the petition to rezone property at 1301, 1305, 1309, 1311 W. Main Street, from "B-1" family to "E-2" drive-in district be tabled until the November 7, 1967 meeting of the Planning Board.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-91-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Rosemary Thurber Reynolds, to rezone a parcel at 1618 W. Holmes Road, from "A" one family to "D-1" professional district be denied.

The Board has investigated the possibilities of a higher residential density for this area and believe that development at 12 units per acre would be a reasonable land use and transition zone between Holmes Road and the potential residential development South of Holmes Road, and the industrial district North of the properties. Even though the 12 unit density would be reasonable, there are no density controls that can be applied on a parcel by parcel basis of less than 1 acre.

Storm sewers are another problem. The Public Service Department has indicated that development along this area of Holmes Road should be held to a minimum until proper storm drainage is available from the West, and when density controls can be applied that will control development at a maximum of 12-14 units per acre.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-99-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to

City Council that the petition by Leo A. Farhat, acting for Pure Oil Company, to rezone a parcel at 3337 and 3345 S. Washington at Holmes Road described as:

Lots 159 and 160 of Half Acre Land Company Subdivision

from "A" one family (Lot 159) and "F" commercial and "J" parking to "E-2" drive-in district be denied.

Generally service stations must be substantiated on a neighborhood basis. K. W. Walter, geographic adviser to the Imperial Oil Company, states that initially about 50% of the business at a station in a developing area is drawn from the immediate local neighborhood, or within about a one mile radius. As the area matures the proportion of business from within this radius increases to perhaps two-thirds of the total. The high incidence of service stations within the area and the maturity of the residential neighborhood in the area would not seem to justify another service station.

Another major factor which must be considered when dealing with applications for service station zoning is traffic flow.

Studies made in Michigan and Ohio show that about 38 per cent of the vehicles entering service stations crossed the flow of oncoming traffic to do so.

The existing traffic flow at this intersection is already constricted due to the angle of intersection. Development in the area already proposed and approved will add to traffic conflicts.

While it may be argued that development of a service station may greatly improve the vision, however it will also create more traffic movement, particularly turning movements which cross opposing traffic flows and sidewalks, than almost any other type of building or activity.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-103-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Thomas D. Gallie, to rezone a parcel in the 6600 block S. Aurelius Road described as:

Lots No. 7 and 8, Plat of Hartland Subd., a replat of part of Lot 19 and part of Lot 18 and part of Outlot "A" of Maple Grove Subd., a part of the

E. 1/2 of S.E. 1/4 Section 10, T3N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one residential to "C-2" family district be denied.

There are no public utilities or facilities in the area, and none are projected until overall development of the area occurs.

Granting of the request could foster uncontrolled development in the area, and lead to mixed and undesirable land use, fostering urban sprawl.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be developed in accord with the existing zoning.

The proposed zoning map indicates this area as single family residential.

The change could establish a precedent in terms of multiple development without sewer facilities, which is undesirable.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-104-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Planning Board, City of Lansing, to rezone a parcel at 300-318 Seymour Street, from "E" and "D" apartment to Community Unit Plan be approved subject to:

Provision for expanded parking area should a need arise.

That the location of the building on the site be resolved to the mutual satisfaction of the Housing and Redevelopment Boards.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-105-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the petition to rezone property at S.W. quadrant of I-496 and Dunckel Road, from "A" one residential to "F" commercial and "J" parking district be tabled

until the November 7, 1967 meeting of the Planning Board.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-106-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the petition for approval of a Community Unit Plan for the property at 2700-3300 E. Jolly Road, be tabled until the November 7, 1967 meeting of the Planning Board.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-107-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Sam R. Clay, to rezone a parcel at 212 W. Mt. Hope Avenue, from "D-M" multiple to "F" commercial district be denied as filed, and that

The North 40 ft. of the property be zoned "J" parking and

The balance of the property be zoned "F" commercial.

Due to the existing land use development, the site is undesirable for development under the existing zoning district.

Development of the area to the West is contrary to the existing zoning regulations.

The site is presently developed as a legal non-conforming commercial use. Zoning of the site would provide for improved off-street parking and screening for adjacent residential uses.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-108-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the request for withdrawal of the petition by Don Tamburino acting for 20th Century Builders, Inc. to rezone a parcel in the 2900 block Ruth Street and 2900 block Aurelius Road described as:

Goodhome Subd. part of the E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 27, T4N, R2W,

Lots 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46 and 54, 55, 56, 57, 58 and 59,

from "A" one residential to "D-1" professional district be accepted and that the property remain in its present classification.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-109-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the petition to rezone property at 700-702 W. Willow Street and the North 49 ft. of Lot 79, Assessor's Plat No. 15, from "B-1" and "C-2" to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied.

Mr. Fink commented in regard to other "D-M" multiple zoning in the neighborhood.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—5.

Nays: Duncan—1.

Z-110-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Peter J. Spadafore, to rezone a parcel in the 200 block S. Fairview Street described as:

Lots 223, 224 and 225, Leslie Park Subdivision, Lansing

from "B-1" family to "C-2" family district be denied.

The change would be contrary to the established land uses pattern of the area (which is predominantly single family residential) and would create an isolated district, i.e., this would be a spot-zone.

The present district boundaries are not illogically drawn in relation to existing conditions.

The proposed zoning district map indicates this area as single family residential.

The lots meet the minimum square footage for two family use (4,191 sq. ft.), but are far below the minimum recommended by the Planning Board (6,500 sq. ft.) as an amendment to the existing zoning regulations.

The change may lead to mixed and undesirable conversions of existing dwellings,

and encourage undesirable land use development.

There are not substantial reasons why the property cannot be developed in accord with the existing zoning regulations.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-111-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Michael Ording, to rezone a parcel at 926 Cleo Street, from "A" one family to "C-2" family district be denied.

The change would be contrary to the established land use pattern of the area (which is predominantly single family residential), and would create an isolated district, i.e., this would be a spot-zone.

The proposed zoning district map indicates this area as single family residential.

Lot frontage is insufficient to handle increased ingress and egress problems resulting from additional density.

The change could promote requests for other conversions in the area, and lead toward mixed and undesirable land use development.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot continue to be used in accord with the existing regulations.

The change could adversely affect living conditions in the area, principally through the increase of traffic, and activity. This is especially true if other conversions are made, and the neighborhood land use takes a complete change.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-112-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Leo E. Farhat acting for PAC Advertising, to rezone a

parcel at 1021 Moores River Drive, from "B-1" family to "D-1" district be denied.

This request does not coincide with the land use pattern envisaged by the Master Plan.

The isolated district created by this change would no doubt lead to further requests of a non-residential character which could seriously deter the improvement of adjacent properties and negate the improvement of South Logan Street with respect to traffic capacity.

The very essence of zoning is the imposition of reasonable restraints upon the use of property. If the subject property cannot reasonably be used in accord with existing zoning then the present district boundaries are obviously illogical. The subject property does front on a major street, however, the proposed relocation will reduce the ill effects fostered by high volumes of fast moving traffic. The higher costs involved with the proposed boulevard have been justified because it will preserve the residential property values. Unless the City of Lansing also protects these residential properties from the adverse influence of non-residential uses the need for the boulevard becomes dubious.

The fact that this application is for property fronting on a major street does not justify a less restrictive non-residential use. An impossible situation would be created if all arterial street frontages had to be developed with non-residential uses.

The Board believes that the property can be used in accord with the existing zoning.

It should also be noted that this site lies within an area which has been slated for conservation by the Community Renewal Program.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-113-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Lynn L. Sible, to rezone a parcel at 1309 E. Grand River, from "C-2" family to "H" light industrial district be denied.

The proposed change would foster uncontrolled development along this area of East Grand River and lead to mixed and undesirable land use.

The change would be contrary to the established land use pattern, and would

create an isolated industrial district in this sense, it would constitute a spot-zone.

The change may adversely affect property values in the area, and deter the improvement or development of adjacent properties in accord with the existing zoning regulations.

The "C-2" family district along this area of East Grand River is considered as a transition zone between Grand River Avenue, a major arterial, and the interior single family residential. It allows for the conversion of existing single family dwellings to apartments, protecting the residential neighborhoods from the encroachments and adverse influences of commercial uses.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be used for proposed allowed under the present zoning.

The proposed zoning map indicates two family development for this site.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as medium density residential 4-10 dwelling units per net acre.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-114-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council, that the petition to rezone property at 2200 S. Cedar Street, from "C-2" family to "J" parking district be denied.

Discussion followed.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus and Siebert—5.

Nays: Reynolds—1.

Z-115-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition to rezone property at 605 S. Holmes Street, from "B-1" family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied.

Mr. Reynolds commented in regard to the density of the proposed amendment. Mr. Duncan commented in regard to the shortage of available housing in the community.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—5.

Nays: Duncan—1.

Z-116-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the petition to rezone property at 1325 E. Jolly Road, from "A" one family to light industrial district be tabled thirty days, and further recommend that the adjacent property owners be notified of a public hearing November 7, 1967 to consider rezoning to "H" light industrial.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-117-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by James R. Duncan, to rezone a parcel at Orchard Court, from "C-2" to "D-M" multiple district be denied.

Based on the established land use development the Board cannot justify a density greater than has been previously recommended. The bulk and height allowed would be incompatible with the existing development immediately West of the site.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-119-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Richard Mermelstein and Sidney Mermelstein to rezone a parcel at 5814 S. Pennsylvania Avenue, from "J" parking to "F" commercial district be denied as filed, and that the

West 20 feet of the East 55 feet of the South 20 feet of the North 45 feet of Lot No. 7, Midway Plaza No 1, City of Lansing

be rezoned from "J" parking to "F" commercial district.

This action will permit erection of the sign at a point 35 feet West of the Pennsylvania Avenue right-of-way line. The indiscriminate placing of advertising signs will negate the aesthetic values built into the area and generally contribute to the chaotic, confusing situation prevalent on most commercially developed streets.

The Committee believes that if the sign proposed is located as close as possible to the building, a precedent will be established which will promote a more aesthetically pleasing commercial district.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-120-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council, that the petition by Schmidt Brothers, to rezone a parcel at 1000 W. Dunlap Street described as:

Lot No. 39 of Logancrest Subdivision, located on part of Section No. 28, and 29, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing

from "A" one residential district to "J" parking district be granted.

The Board found that this change would not increase the non-residential traffic on Dunlap Street, but would alleviate the problems of the joint drive over Lot 38 and 39.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-122-67

Motion by Duncan, seconded by Siebert, that the petition to rezone property at 2122 N. Logan Street, from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be tabled until the November 7, 1967 meeting of the Planning Board.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

STREETS COMMITTEE

ROW-11-67

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Siebert, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council, that the request to vacate a stub alley (10 ft. x 182 ft.) extending South from Oak Street between Ohio and Indiana Avenue, be granted.

The alley is presently being used by the abutting properties, and it would not be advisable to vacate this alley as it would deny the adjacent property owners public access to the rear of their properties.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

ROW-14-67

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council, that the request to vacate a 13 ft. stub alley extending South from Prospect Street between Hill Street and Hosmer Street, be approved subject to a full width utility easement and the agreement of all abutting property owners.

The alley has not been improved or used and there is no reason to believe that it will be in the future. The Public Service Department has a sanitary sewer in the alley for which a utility easement is required.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert.

Nays: None.

S-27-65F No. 1 Georgetown Subdivision No. 1, Final Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Siebert, that the Final Plat of Georgetown Subdivision be approved subject to the following conditions:

All public improvements shall be installed including water, sanitary sewers, storm sewers and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks and such other improvements as required by the Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

The installation of all required monuments and the posting of financial security in the amount determined by the Public Service Director prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All lots should be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.

All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Acts of 1929 as amended shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

S-27-65F No. 2 Georgetown No. 2 Final Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Siebert, that the Final Plat of Georgetown Sub-

division be approved, subject to the following conditions:

All public improvements shall be installed including water, sanitary sewers, storm sewers and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks and such other improvements as required by the Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

The installation of all required monuments and the posting of financial security in the amount determined by the Public Service Director prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All lots should be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.

All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Acts of 1929 as amended shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

S-27-65F No. 3 Georgetown No. 3 Final Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Siebert, that the Final Plat of Georgetown Subdivision No. 3 be approved subject to the following conditions:

All public improvements shall be installed including water, sanitary sewers, storm sewers and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks and such other improvements as required by the Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

The installation of all required monuments and the posting of financial security in the amount determined by the Public Service Director prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All lots should be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.

All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Acts of 1929 as amended shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

S-9-66F Coachlight Estates, Final Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Siebert, that the Final Plat of Coachlight Estates be approved, subject to the following conditions:

All public improvements shall be installed complete with public utilities including water, sanitary sewers, storm sewers, and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, sidewalks and such other improvements as required under Section VI D of the Lansing Subdivision Regulations.

The installation of all required monuments and the posting of financial security in the amount of:

Curb and gutter	\$ 25,000.00
Monuments	1,960.00
Gravel	15,000.00
Storm sewer	200,000.00
Sanitary sewer	180,000.00
TOTAL	\$371,960.00

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All lots should be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.

All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Act of 1929 as amended shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Brown, Assistant Planning Director, reported that the City Council was putting the City Income Tax item on their agenda at their next meeting.

Discussion followed.

Mr. Brown discussed the Michigan Society of Planning Officials 1967 Fall Conference which is to be held October 17, 18 and 19 at Gaylord, Michigan.

Meeting adjourned at 12:35 A.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

B/C

We have been advised that the actual closure of the streets can take place as soon as the roadway is open to traffic and the land has been dedicated to the City.

Adverse weather conditions have made it impossible to surface the street with bituminous pavement, but arrangements have been made with the contractor on the site to properly maintain the surface until the paving can be completed.

The College attorneys have been instructed to draw up the deed which will dedicate the roadway to the City. This will be delivered to you on or before January 2, 1968.

I would like, on behalf of the Board of Trustees, to thank you for your cooperation and assistance on this and other College projects.

Sincerely,
PHILIP J. GANNON,
President.

Referred to Committee on Public Service and Highways.

Council adjourned at 8:10 P.M.

THEO FULTON,
City Clerk.
Lansing, Michigan
December 11, 1967.
F/B

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, October 17, 1967

Meeting called to order at 7:39 P.M. by Chairman Bretz.

Ordinance

SS-24-66 Mobile Home Ordinance

Mr. Brown, Assistant Planning Director, reported that the Board has been requested to reconsider the mobile home ordinance as a part of the Community Unit Plan procedure, by City Council.

Mr. Brown cited the pros and cons of the proposal concluding with the recommendation that the Mobile Home Ordinance be again recommended in its original form, and if not acceptable that the Ordinance Committee of Council be invited to meet with the Ordinance Committee of the Planning Board to discuss possibilities of amending or changing to develop a document that will increase community livability.

Matter again referred to the Ordinance Committee.

SS-25-67 Community Unit Plan Policy

This matter is to be voted on at the next regular meeting of the Planning Board on November 7, 1967.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Urban Renewal

Mr. Reynolds brought the Board up to date on recent urban renewal developments. He stated that instead of having a major retail store as a tenant in the 100 block of Washington Avenue there could be a group of independently owned stores.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Guernsey reported that there would soon be a meeting of the Capital Improvements Technical Improvements Committee to make preparation of the Capital Improvements Program.

Mr. Alan Tubbs, of the Planning Department Staff, reported on Capital Area Manpower Service stating the program is the correlation of personal aspects to job performance. Its purpose is to formulate a program to succeed in retraining individ-

uals. The co-ordination of physical and social problems with emphasis on providing individuals with jobs is the main objective of the program.

Mr. Duncan emphasized the importance of communication between the various social agencies.

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICE BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, November 21, 1967

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Russel A. Lawler.

ROLL CALL

Commissioners present: S. Don Potter, Henry Noack, Robert Rollis, Jr., Russel Lawler, Elizabeth Lawry, Leonard McConnell, and Robert Brooks—7.

Commissioners absent: Harry Guyselman—1.

Mr. Guyselman was excused from the meeting.

Also present during the board meeting were the Hon. Judge Earl McDonald; Mr. Farhat, City Attorney's office; and Mr. Raymond Burgess, City Finance Director.

COMMUNICATIONS

With permission of the board members present, Chairman Lawler referred to the letter received from Mr. Michael Cavanaugh, City Attorney, advising that a member of his office would attend the November Board meeting in regard to the complaint received from the Michigan Civil Rights Commission. He stated that in view of the fact that both Judge McDonald and Mr. Farhat were present, that this matter be considered the first item of business.

Chairman Lawler reiterated the action of the Board at its previous meeting, that

the Board meet with the City Attorney, and the presiding judge of the Municipal Court regarding the placing of a person's race upon a traffic ticket.

Chairman Lawler referred to the motion of the Board at its previous meeting, that "We feel this is a matter that should be taken up with the Municipal Court, since the Court is the one who made up the ticket, and that we do not feel we have the ability to instruct the Municipal Court, or that we have the ability to instruct the Chief of Police in this matter.

Judge McDonald: The Court will continue to make their own forms since it is our prerogative, and not that of the Police Dept. This is a well thought out ticket, approved by the American Bar Association. U. S. Federal Judge Raymond Starr and myself were members of the committee who formulated this ticket. We want a description on a ticket so that when a warrant is issued, there will be adequate information for any officer to make an arrest on the warrant. Having this information, the police officer can eliminate maybe 10% and maybe 90% at the outset. It is only a matter of description, the same as his height, his weight, and the color of his hair and eyes, and this is the only purpose for its being there.

Another function of a complete description is to help avoid the wrongful arrest of a person with the same name, or a person whose name has been wrongfully used by a violator, but who would not match the description of the arrested person.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, November 7, 1967

Chairman Bretz called the meeting to order at 7:35 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Absent: Duncan and Fink—2.

HEARINGS

Z-138-67

Mr. Leo Farhat, attorney, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at Lockbridge Drive and Norburn Way south of Waycross Street, from "A" one family to "C-2" family district.

Mr. Farhat discussed the surrounding land use and stated the petitioner proposed to develop the property with two-family dwellings to serve as a buffer between the residential property to the north and the I-96 Expressway to the south of the subject property.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-138-67

Mr. Leo Farhat, attorney, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 1601 E. Cavanaugh Road, from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Mr. Farhat stated there are about 80 acres in total in the proposed development, about 47 of which were in the 1947 flood plain and 33 acres of which are scheduled for development with multiple housing. A graphic illustration showing the proposed development in three dimensional form was shown to the Board. There will be 39 units, 38 will be 24 unit and one 12 unit for a total of 924 units. Project term is about five years in development, and expect it will be necessary to plat the land.

He proceeded to comment in regard to the traffic pattern in the area.

Mr. Kreaton Cullimore, 4009 Ruth Avenue questioned the development regarding the ingress and egress to the site, future development in the area, possible road improvements, if the project would be expanded in the future, and if the property owners would be notified if anything different was proposed.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

S-12-67P Greenfields Subdivision,
Preliminary Plat

D. Gregory Main, Planning Department, discussed the location, proposed land use, street pattern, sewer extension and the recommended street extension of the proposed development.

Mr. John Kronstable, Vice President of Kassuba Development Company, Milwaukee, Wisconsin was present in regard to the proposal.

Mr. Black asked if there were any objections to the street extension proposed by the Staff, and Mr. Kronstable replied that this has been discussed with the adjoining property owner and stated he thought this would be all right.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

S-13-67P Vercruyse Subdivision,
Preliminary Plat

D. Gregory Main, Planning Department, discussed the location, size, land use in the area, present zoning, street pattern and sewer extension of the proposed plat.

Jonathan Maire representing the developer, was present. He stated that their

position on the proposed cul-de-sac is that it should be uniformly distributed.

Mr. Gaus asked if the developer was agreeable to a portion of the cul-de-sac out of his property, and Mr. Maire replied in the affirmative.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

**Z-95-67 Property on Richmond Street,
Proposed Community Unit Plan**

Mr. Ronald F. Nino, Planning Department discussed the location, proposed use, size, parking ratio, density, access to the proposed development.

Mr. Anthony Nosal, adjacent property owner to the north appeared in support of the proposed amendment.

No one appeared in objection to the proposal.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

**Z-124-67 2800 Block Pleasant Grove Road,
Proposed Community Unit Plan**

Mr. Ronald F. Nino, Planning Department, discussed the location proposed use of the property, parking ratio, size of the land, density, entrance and exit to the site, and the land use in the surrounding area.

Mr. Barber, the developer was present.

Mr. Robert Babb, 2503 Victor Street, presented to the Board a petition containing 113 signatures in opposition to the proposed amendment.

There were approximately 33 people present in opposition to the development.

Mr. Edward Roe, 2509 Victor Street, spoke in opposition.

Mr. Charles Mange, 2808 Victor Street, spoke in opposition.

Mr. William Sheaffer, 2931 Pleasant Grove Road, spoke in opposition.

Mr. Paul Nelhiebel, 2822 Pleasant Grove Road, spoke in opposition.

Mr. William West, 2311 Victor Street, spoke in opposition.

Cornelius Pettit, 2515 Victor Street, spoke in opposition.

The main objection of those in opposition was the additional traffic that would be

generated by the proposed development, the additional load on the schools, the appearance and upkeep of the property and that the proposed multiple dwelling structures would not be compatible with the existing surrounding residences.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-127-67

Mr. Glen Slucter, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property in the 1900 block of Alpha Street, from "A" one family to "J" parking district.

Mr. Slucter stated that the purpose of the petition is to develop the site in conjunction with the property adjacent to the north, for which additional parking is badly needed.

Mr. Guernsey commented that the Master Plan denotes this area for small commercial shopping center which has not yet completely developed. This request is therefore in accordance with the Master Plan.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-128-67

Mr. Sprayman, petitioner, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at the northwest corner of W. Mt. Hope Avenue and Bedford Street, from "A" one family to "C-2" family district.

Mr. Sprayman stated it is his intention to build a two story colonial two-family home on the subject property, which he feels would be compatible with the surrounding homes in the area. He proceeded to describe the surrounding land use and commented in regard to his trying to sell the land for single family use.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment, however, two letters were received in opposition to the proposal. They were from Mr. John B. Ellis, 2921 S. Cambridge Road and Mr. Charles G. Hayden, 1811 Bedford Road, Lansing, Michigan.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-129-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition, to rezone property in the 1800 block of Ada Street, from "B-1" family residential to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Mr. David Duncan arrived at 9:02 P.M.

Z-130-67

Mr. Roger Young, real estate representative of Mobile Oil Corporation, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 929 N. Cedar Street, from "C-2" family to "E-2" drive-in district.

Mr. Fred Parks, whose mother owns property in back of the subject property, questioned if the service station zoning was granted, could the petitioners put something else on the property: Chairman Bretz, answered that if the zoning was approved the petitioner would have to put a gas station on the property.

Mr. Young commented that lots 12 and 11 were rezoned to "E-2" within the last 12 months but that lot 8 was overlooked and this is the reason for the petition. Mr. Young asked if it would be possible at this time to include a triangular shaped parcel of land south and adjacent to lot 12?

Mr. Guernsey suggested that the petitioner submit a revised legal description to the City Council.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Mr. Russell Fink arrived at 9:07 P.M.

Z-131-67

Mr. Arthur Klepper, petitioner, appeared in behalf of the petition, to rezone property at 2502 N. East Street, from "J" parking to "F" commercial district.

Mr. Klepper stated that it is his intention to place gas pumps on the property and perhaps a shelter for the attendant.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-132-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 1110 Jerome Street, from "D-M" multiple to "J" parking district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-134-67

Mr. Skamser, from Harold Davis Associates, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 2717 N. Logan Street, from "A" one family to "E-2" drive-in district.

Mr. Skamser stated it is the petitioner's intention to remove the sign company, grocery store and house that are presently on the subject property. A service station with landscaping will be erected.

No one appeared in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-135-67

Mr. Tamburino, developer, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 3333 Maloney Street, from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Mr. Anthony Nosal, property owner to the east of the subject property spoke in favor of the proposed rezoning.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-136-67

Mr. Wilson Perry, petitioner, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 6000 and 6012 South Logan Street, from "A" one family to "F" commercial.

Mr. Perry stated that the property was zoned "A" one family upon annexation to the City of Lansing. The purpose of the petition is to return the property to commercial use.

Nancy Foss, who lives behind the subject property, commented in regard to their trash burning and lack of upkeep of the premises. She also asked what is proposed for the property and Mr. Perry replied there were no definite plans.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-137-67

Mrs. Hilda Musselman, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 316 W. Genesee Street, from "D" apartment to "J" parking.

Mrs. Musselman stated there is a definite need for the parking for the people who attend the church. She stated that the

drive would not be blocked, that neighbors would be able to get through.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-139-67

Mr. Arthur Wible, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 4826 S. Cedar Street, from "A" one family and "C-2" family to "F" commercial.

Mr. Wible stated that Dr. Ralph Spagnuolo has an option to purchase the property subject to rezoning. The applicant proposes a combination of stores and offices for the site. Mr. Wible stated he is the administrator for the subject property and asked the Board's consideration in this matter.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-140-67

Mr. Wayne Wilson, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 2812-2816 Cynwood Street, from "A" one family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Mr. Wilson stated he had contacted the neighbors in the immediate area of the proposed rezoning and they were in favor of the proposed development, and that it would be an improvement to the neighborhood.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-141-67

Mr. Mike Warren, representing petitioner, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 3007 N. East Street, from "A" one family to "F" commercial district.

Mr. Warren stated that this property was reverted to "A" one zoning upon annexation to the City of Lansing, but it has not been used as "A" one for some time. The petitioner's propose a carry out food store on the property.

Mr. Guernsey asked if they were aware whether there were storm or sanitary sewers in front of the property and if the petitioner would be opposed to petitioning

for sewers? Mr. Warren replied that this was rather new for him but supposed that if they needed the sewers they would have to get them.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-142-67

Mr. James Hovey, attorney, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 912, 922, and 924 South Pennsylvania Avenue, from "C-2" family to "E-2" drive-in shop district. Mr. Hovey presented a summary sheet and map which indicated the general lay out of the subject property. Mr. Hovey discussed exit ramp of I-496 in regard to the subject property, traffic problem on this corner, and the changes taking place in the neighborhood which make this property not desirable as a residential property.

A petition in opposition to the proposed rezoning was submitted containing 45 names. Received and placed on file.

An artist's conception of the type of service station proposed for this lot was presented to the Board.

Mr. Stanley Soules, 1001 Raider Street, spoke in opposition.

Mary Ann Bond, appearing for Lucille Bond, 1000 S. Pennsylvania questioned the open hours of the proposed service station, the grading of the property, and the access to the site.

Mrs. Helen Shriver, 919 Raider Street, spoke in opposition.

Mrs. Soules, 101 Raider Street, spoke in opposition.

Mr. Harrison Winters, one of the petitioners was present and spoke in behalf of the petition stating he felt they had no other recourse than to see the property.

Mrs. Veda, one of the petitioners, also spoke in behalf of the petition.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-143-67

Mr. Donald Sanderson, petitioner, spoke in regard to the request to rezone property at 4400 block of Christiansen Road, from "A" one family to "C-2" family district.

Mr. Sanderson stated that this is a large lot and he proposes a ranch style duplex which would be attractive and add to the neighborhood.

Mr. Merlin Stout, 4900 Cherryland Drive, who owns the adjacent property, questioned if there are any restrictions as to the type of building after the property is rezoned.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-144-67

Mr. Robert Quandt, petitioner, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 1032 N. Capitol Avenue, from "C-2" family to "D-1" professional office district.

Mr. Quandt stated he has operated as an insurance agency in conjunction with a rental unit on the subject property since 1959. Purpose in asking for rezoning to become legal as "D-1" professional zoning.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-145-67

Francis Fine appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at Waverly Road and Grand River Avenue, from "A" one family to "F" commercial district.

Mr. Fine stated that the portion requested for rezoning would lie north and west of the proposed realignment of Waverly Road. In terms of location and type of enterprise adjacent to it would justify the Board's consideration of "F" commercial zoning.

Mr. Charles Woodruff, 3708 Delta River Drive, asked if the city has the right-of-way of realigned Waverly Road and Mr. Guernsey replied in the negative.

Mr. Woodruff spoke in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Mrs. Charles Woodruff, 3708 Delta River Drive, spoke in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Harold Roberts, 3000 Arcadia Drive, spoke in opposition.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-146-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 727 N. Capitol Avenue, from "D" apartment to "E" apartment district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Mr. Anthony Nosal spoke in regard to the function and duties of the Planning Board and Staff.

Mr. Black commented in regard to receiving the minutes sooner and raised the question that perhaps they could be briefer.

Recess from 10:36 to 11:05 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Fink, that the minutes of August 1, August 15, September 12, 19 and 26, and October 3 and 17 be approved as printed.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-199-65

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Karl Kessler, to approve a Community Unit Plan for a parcel of land in the 1400-1500 Marquette Street, described as:

Commencing Northwest corner Lot 168 Mitshkun's Oak Grove Subd., No. 2, thence Southwesterly to Southwest corner lot 168, Northwesterly along Northerly line Marquette Ave. 250 ft., Northeasterly 200 ft. to Southerly line C & O RR R/W, Southeasterly 250 ft. to beginning, Section 5, T4N, R2W

be approved to:

Screening along the Southeast property line and Southwest property line.

Site grading plans are to be reviewed by the Public Service Department for proper storm drainage.

A petition for storm sewers is to be signed by the property owners and be submitted to the Public Department.

The Board believes the proposed change to Townhouses will be an improvement in that this type of unit is more similar in character to the single family units in the neighborhood than an apartment building would have been. The new site is a definite improvement over the formerly approved plan.

The Board further advises that:

Property adjacent to the area included in the plan will not be adversely affected.

The plan is consistent with the intent and purpose of Chapter 36-7 to promote the public health, safety morals and general welfare.

That buildings shall be used only for residential purposes.

Several property owners were present in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-26-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Chris A. Baryames, to rezone a parcel at 600 S. Logan, from "E-2" drive-in shop district to "F" commercial district be denied as filed, and that the

West 20 ft. of the property

be rezoned from "E-2" drive-in to "F" parking, and

The balance of the property

be rezoned from "E-2" drive-in to "E-1" drive-in district. Screening be provided along the West line of the property, except for the residential set-back on Hillsdale Street.

A change of zoning would encourage redevelopment of the site, which otherwise may remain vacant, creating a blighting influence on the area.

The proposed change would not be contrary to the established land use pattern.

The Board does not believe the proposed change would deter the improvement or development of adjacent properties, nor adversely affect property values.

The number of gas stations operating in the vicinity (7), and the fact that this station has remained vacant, makes it reasonable to assume that the property will not be used under the existing zoning regulations.

The Community Renewal survey indicates this area for redevelopment.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-55-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the petition to rezone property at 833 N. Capitol Avenue, from "D-M" multiple dwelling to "D-1" professional office district, be tabled pending the adoption of the amendment to the Central City Plan

allowing for the expansion of offices and services.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-84-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Action Realty, to rezone a parcel in the 1301, 1305, 1309, 1311 W. Main Street, described as:

Lots 1, 2, 3, 4 Block Stebbins-Moore Re-plat

from "B-1" residential to "E-2" drive-in shopping district be denied.

Present land use in the area south of Main Street is residential.

North of Main Street the I-496 Expressway is presently under construction. Other major changes proposed for the area will include the widening, extension and designation of Birch Street as a southbound one way state trunkline highway with construction about 5 years away.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area as an industrial district.

If this request is granted it could lead to further requests of a similar nature which would ultimately usurp vitally needed industrial land, with commercial uses.

This request if granted will also prematurely remove four substantial homes.

The applicant has made several statements in support of this request for rezoning which should be clarified.

The lack of service stations west of this site within the city limits should have no bearing on the relative merits of this site for the use proposed, as there are two stations just outside the city which presumably serve the available market.

The argument that this site will be the only site available to serve the Oldsmobile complex is not supportable as the predominant portion of the complex including large parking areas is located east of Logan Street. This would lead one to believe that the major amount of traffic into the complex will pass two existing stations at the corner of Main and Logan to reach their destination.

The position of this site with respect to the off ramp immediately west of Birch Street could cause a serious conflict. Any traffic existing from the expressway must cross two lanes of traffic in the short distance of one block to enter this site.

It should be pointed out that the residential neighborhood in this area is relatively intact but will quickly decline and

could be easily usurped by other non-industrial uses should this petition be granted.

One person was in the audience who objected to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Fink—1.

Z-105-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Greenfields Company, to rezone a parcel in the Southwest quadrant of I-496 and Dunckel interchange, described as:

The Northeast 15 acres of the Southeast $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 35, T4N, R2W, lying South and West of I-496 and Dunckel Roads, City of Lansing, Ingham County Michigan

from "A" one residential to "F" commercial and "J" parking district, be granted and that the following requirements be applied in determining the building area and parking area ratio for purposes of developing the site plan upon which the formal action of Council will be based.

Motor Motel: 1 parking space for each guest room provided; 1 parking space for each 6 seats in designated dining areas and cocktail lounges (not to include assembly and banquet halls); 1 parking space for each 10 seats in designated assembly hall or conventional hall area;

1 parking space for each employee engaged in the conduct of the motor hotel activities.

Planned Shopping Center—4 square feet of parking area for every 1 square foot of floor area contained within the shopping center.

Detached Bank—1 parking space for each 100 square feet of floor space area.

Where reference is made to parking space this shall be interpreted to mean an area of nine (9) feet wide by twenty (20) feet deep and shall in all cases be accessible from a common drive at least ten (10) feet wide.

Wherein the above refers to conditions to be imposed in determining the relationship of building area to parking area, the developer should be required to submit a detailed site plan for the commercial development before Council takes action with respect to said zoning. The above conditions could be used as a guide in developing said site plan upon which the proposed

"F" and "J" districts may be described for rezoning purposes.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-106-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Greenfields Company, for approval to a Community Unit Plan in the 2700 to 3300 block E. Jolly Road, described as:

Southeast $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 35, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan except the Northeast 15 acres lying south and west of I-496 and Dunckel Road and also lands previously dedicated to the State of Michigan and to the County of Ingham for road purposes

be approved subject to:

A maximum density of 12 dwelling units per acre, exclusive of the commercial area and

1. That the land be platted, and that a stub street be provided to the undeveloped property to the east.
2. That the school and park area (10 acres) be located in a more central location. This does not eliminate the recreation facilities proposed for this central area.
3. That both apartment units and townhouse units be developed.
 - a. These units should be grouped in clusters as opposed to integrated groupings of both types.
 - b. That townhouse units compose at least 25% of the 1380 unit total.
 - c. That not more than 50% of the townhouses be one or two bedroom units.
 - d. Townhouse units are intended for family occupancy, and we recommend that these units be used only for families as opposed to groups of non-related persons living together.
 - e. The apartment buildings should be placed along Jolly Road and on the site the developer proposed for the school and park. (This area is to be exchanged for a more central school park site).

4. That there be a variety of facades on the various buildings, in large developments such as this, architectural styles and massing arrangements become critical factors ensuring a quality retention. A rejection of techniques designed to produce a higher aesthetic standard usually correlates directly with poor quality development throughout, and consequent rapid rates of deterioration.
 - a. There should be a variation in the height of buildings to avoid monotony.
 - b. Parking areas shall be designed to camouflage these areas and reduce their visual impact. Recessed parking lots, artificial earth mounds evergreen plantings, and natural topography shall be used to their greatest effect toward this end.
5. Arrangements for refuse collection, and the design of waste storage areas should be made so that this facet of high density living is least prominent. No outside storage of refuse shall be permitted. No exterior incineration of refuse shall be permitted.
6. The church site should be located adjacent to the commercial area, so as to allow dual use of the parking facilities of the shopping center.
7. Existing contours shall not be graded to less than 6% except for streets which may be planned for less gradient. Building permits for each cluster of buildings shall be withheld pending receipt of revised contour plan and landscape plan to ensure compliance with items 4 (b) and 7.
8. Prior to City Council approval, a site and landscape plan should be submitted reflecting the above conditions, and the location of buildings, off-street parking, streets, sidewalks, and arrangement of plant material.

The Board's basis for this recommendation is consistent with Section 36-7 of the code and it is further of the opinion that:

1. Property adjacent to the area included in the plan will not be adversely affected.
2. The plan is consistent with the intent and purpose of this chapter to promote the public health, safety, morals and general welfare.
3. That the buildings shall be used only for single family dwellings, two family dwellings, or multiple dwellings and the usual accessory uses such as garages, storage space and community activities including churches.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-116-67

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the rules of procedure be waived to permit Mr. John Dora to speak concerning the subject rezoning.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Property owner of 1325 and 1411 E. Jolly Road, stated he purchased 1325 on the basis of it being zoned light industrial. He wants to buy a lot from Rensen Center which backs up to present lot and construct a building complex on the two.

Mr. Fink stated his concern over piece meal development on the separate lots.

Discussion followed.

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by John Dora, to rezone a parcel at 1325 E. Jolly Road, described as:

Comm. at South $\frac{1}{4}$ post; Section 34, thence W. 80 ft., N. 22 rods, E. 80 ft. to beginning, Section 34, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one residential to "H" light industrial district be granted.

The Planning Board further recommends that the property West and East of this site described as:

Comm. on S. line Section 34, 80 ft. W. of S. $\frac{1}{4}$ posts thence N. 363 ft. W. 78 ft., S. 363 ft. E. 78 ft. to beginning, Section 34, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

Comm. 158 ft. W. of S.E. corner of S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 34, thence N. 363 ft., W. 172 ft. S. 363 ft., E. 172 ft. to beginning, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

Comm. at S. $\frac{1}{4}$ posts Section 34, thence E. 4 R., N. 20 R., W. 4 R., S. 20 R. to beginning Section 34, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

Comm. 4 R., E. of S. $\frac{1}{4}$ post Section 34, thence N. 20 R. E. 4 R., S. 20 R., W. 4 R., to beginning, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

be rezoned from "A" one residential to "H" light industrial district.

The Master Plan indicates these lots as a logical extension of the industrial district North of this site.

The change would remove an isolated district unrelated to the adjacent districts.

The existing homes are in a state of transition—two are vacant—re-zoning will allow redevelopment in accord with the existing land use pattern.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: Fink—1.

Z-119-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the previous action on this petition be rescinded and that the petition by Richard and Sidney Mermelstein, to rezone a parcel at 5814 S. Pennsylvania Avenue, from "J" parking to "F" commercial district be denied.

As a result of the petitioner's decision to relocate the sign, which would not require zoning change, the Committee recommends that the Planning Board reconsider their recommendation of Oct. 3, 1967 and recommend to City Council that the petition be denied, and the Board adopt a policy which would discourage any requests for rezoning to allow signs within the "J" parking district along this area of S. Pennsylvania Avenue.

The Board further recommends that the Building Inspector be requested to check the legal status of other signs in the vicinity.

On October 3, 1967 the Planning Board considered an application for rezoning a small parcel of land on S. Pennsylvania Ave., from "J" parking to "G-2" wholesale to permit an advertising sign adjacent to the right-of-way line. The Board subsequently recommended that the petition be denied as filed and that an area 35 feet back from the right-of-way line be rezoned to allow the sign. The applicant was contacted by the Staff and he indicated that he is in agreement with the concept of preventing the development of another "sign alley" and would prefer to locate his sign 55 feet back from the street line in the "G-2" district. However, the applicant would like some assurance that the Board will be consistent in the consideration of future applications for rezoning to allow signs in the "J" parking district.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-122-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by James B. Hovey, to rezone a parcel at 2122 N. Logan, from "A" residential to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied, and the property owner file a formal application with City Council which would include the subject property and the area to the South. Reconsideration could be based on 15 dwelling units per acre, with two points of ingress and egress.

The Board believes that the location of the site is not family oriented, and that the greater density is considered appropriate.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Heino, and Siebert—6.

Nays: Reynolds—1.

Abstain: Fink—1.

Z-123-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Harry and Don Berger, to rezone a parcel at 3717 S. Pennsylvania Avenue, from "J" parking to "G-2" wholesale district be granted.

The Board has reviewed the proposal in relation to the off-street parking requirements under the proposed code. The site plan indicates that adequate off-street parking will be provided in accordance with the proposed use.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-126-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Thomas

J. Lopus, to rezone a parcel at 4909 S. Logan Street, from "A" one family to "E-2" drive-in shop district be denied.

The proposed change would be contrary to the established land use pattern along the east side of Logan Street. In this sense it would constitute a "spot-zone."

The change may adversely affect property values in the vicinity and may therefore deter the improvement or development of adjacent properties. It would also minimize the future development of adjacent vacant areas in accord with existing zoning.

The change is not in conformance with the comprehensive plan which indicates this area as residential use.

The proposed zoning code indicates this area as multi-family development.

Strip commercial development along major streets detracts from planned commercial centers.

The Community Renewal Survey indicates this area as conservation i.e., the property would maintain its residential character, with possible revisions in density.

Development of part or all of the vacant land in this vicinity should be accompanied by an overall plan to insure complete development.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

S-3-66F (2) Cushion Replat No. 2,

Final Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the Final Plat of Cushion Replat No. 2 be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. All lots be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.

2. The posting of financial security in an amount determined by the Department of Public Service prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

3. All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Acts of 1929, as amended shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

S-9-67P Southland Plaza

Preliminary Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the approval of the preliminary plat of Southland Plaza be amended to reflect the changes proposed subject to the redesign of the intersection at Washington Avenue to produce a right angle intersection.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Motion by Fink, seconded by Siebert, that \$2,500.00 be transferred from account No. 170110 Salaries to account No. 170122 Part Time Employees.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Black, seconded by Fink, that all other matters on the agenda be postponed until the next regular meeting of the Planning Board on November 21, 1967.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Adjourn 12:10 A.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.
C/M

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, November 21, 1967

Meeting called to order at 7:40 P.M. by
Chairman Ramona Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Gaus and Heino
—4.

Absent: Duncan, Fink, Reynolds and
Siebert—4.

HEARING

S-14-67P Hospitality Motor Inns,

Preliminary Plat

D. Gregory Main, Planning Department Staff, discussed the size, location, present zoning and proposed development of the subject property.

Mr. Archie Fraser, attorney representing the petitioner, stated the City Council directed that this land be platted. The preliminary plat is the result of the effort of Mr. Stephens a professional engineer. Establishment of the sewer has been finalized. The building program is being held up pending receipt of a building permit, which cannot be issued until the sewers are installed. We hope that when this is ready, we will be able to get construction underway.

Mr. Fink arrived at 7:45 P.M.

Discussion followed regarding the development of adjacent lands.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

Recess from 7:55 to 8:40 P.M.

Mr. Duncan arrived during the recess period.

Mr. Fink introduced Mr. Thomas Brown, legislator from the 57th District.

BUSINESS SESSION

Approval of minutes, Motion by Black, seconded by Heino, that the minutes of November 11, 1967 be approved as printed.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-131-67

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition to rezone property at 2502 North East Street, from "J" parking to "F" commercial be granted and further recommend that the west $\frac{1}{2}$ of lot 34 north of the subject property be rezoned from "J" parking to "F" commercial and that all surface areas used for channeling traffic through the car washing establishment be paved and further that no traffic be allowed to back up on Call Street.

Mr. Duncan asked if it was correct that no action on zoning matters could be taken by the Board unless 6 members were present. This was confirmed by Mr. Edwin P. Brown, Assistant Planning Director.

Mr. Duncan then asked that the following comment be recorded in total:

"In lieu of the fact the democracy in which we operate does not necessitate a three-fourths majority for any action, and in as much as there are members of the Planning Board that because of their action have made it impossible for a minority group of disadvantaged people to participate in a turn key project, I am excusing myself from the meeting Madam Chairman and there will be no action, I assume, tonight. Good night."

Mr. Duncan left the meeting.

Mr. Fink withdrew his motion regarding Z-131-67. Mr. Heino withdrew his second regarding Z-131-67.

Mr. Black asked that Mr. Reynolds who

was attending the Redevelopment Board meeting in the building be asked to attend the Planning Board meeting in order that six members of the Planning Board be present to act on the zoning matters on the agenda.

Mrs. Bretz concurred in this request.

SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE

Mr. D. Gregory Main, discussed the proposed subdivision control regulations stating that they are necessary due to the new State Plat Act. He gave the background of the proposed control stating that the major difference is that City Council will be involved in the approval of the preliminary plat. Previously the Planning Board had sole authority in this area. He stated the three steps in subdivision control as being: pre-application stage, preliminary plat stage, and final platting. The deposit procedure, design, and improvements are the same as previously used.

Discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Ordinance Committee.

STREET COMMITTEE

ROW-16-67

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the Planning Board reaffirm their previous recommendation to vacate the entire (795-.30 x 20 ft.) alley extending between Cooper Avenue and Mt. Hope Avenue, west of Boston Blvd. subject to:

1. The agreement of all abutting property owners.
2. A 20 foot easement for public utility being retained by the City.
3. Approval of the City Attorney.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus, that the petition be tabled until property owners abutting the alley be contacted to their disposition in the matter.

Mr. Brown explained that this point is covered in condition No. 1 in the condition for approval.

Mr. Fink withdrew his motion to table the petition. Mr. Gaus withdrew his second to table the petition.

Motion to vacate the entire alley subject to above conditions carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus and Heino—5.

Nays: None.

Mr. Reynolds arrived at 9:20 P.M.

BP-4-67

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the proposed connector of Stabler Street, which presently dead ends at the north line of Ingham Medical Hospital property be extended southeasterly across the site to connect with Willard Street, be approved and that the Staff be directed to study the possibility of vacating Everett Lane from Willard to Denver Streets.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

SS-43-67

Mr. Gaus suggested that the Staff study the possibility of vacating more of Everett Lane than just the one block, that the vacation be to Hodge Street instead of Denver Street.

SS-14-67 South Logan Street Zoning Policy

Mr. Nino pointed out that there have been some modifications to the proposed policy since its last presentation to the Board. The area covered by the proposed policy has been extended from Jolly Road to Holmes Road. Mr. Nino stated that in the reappraisal of the policy the conclusion was reached that there was more than sufficient land designated for commercial use. Therefore, a portion of the designated commercial has been withdrawn. Also 10 acres of elimination of non-conforming uses to be considered.

Motion by Black, seconded by Fink, that the (SS-14-67) South Logan Zoning Policy be referred to the Zoning and Ordinance Committees of the Board for review and report at the next regular meeting of the Board.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Motion by Fink, seconded by Black, that the Zoning Committee be recognized for the purpose of recommendations on agenda.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-181-67

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Arthur H. Klepper, to rezone a parcel at 2502 N. East Street, from "J" Parking to "F" commercial district be granted, and further recommends that the West $\frac{1}{2}$ of Lot 34 North of the subject property be rezoned from "J" parking to "F" commercial district, and that all surface areas used for channeling traffic through the car washing establishment be paved and further that no traffic be allowed to back up on Call Street.

The subject property was zoned "J" parking with the anticipation that the commercial property along north East Street would develop in the type of use that would require off street parking, and would also provide a transition between the commercial development and the existing residence to the East.

The ultimate use of the commercial complex appears to be established, and is the type of use that is highway oriented, and does not require a high ratio of off-street parking.

The applicant has constructed a 5 ft. masonry wall along the East boundary of the property which provides added protection for both the adjacent residential development and the commercial complex. Ingress to the site will be from Call Street, with egress on North East Street and Banghart Street. In either case these points do not extend any further into the residential area than the existing commercial development to the North and South.

The Board does not believe the change will produce any additional adverse affect on the adjacent residential properties.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-146-67

Motion by Fink, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Charles M. Taylor, acting for R. E. Olds Company, to rezone a parcel at Madison Street and 727 N. Capitol Avenue described as:

Lots one (1), Two (2), and Three (3) of Block fifty-five (55) of the original plat of the City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "D" apartment to "E" apartment district, be granted.

The Board would further like to point out that because this is contrary to the Central City Plan, it is not meant to establish a precedent, but to merely allow for the continuous up keep of an existing use.

The site under consideration is developed with a 40 unit apartment building with commercial uses on the ground floor. The development was built in 1927, and has functioned as such since that time.

The commercial development on the ground floor is non-conforming under the present zoning, and is not permitted to expand.

The applicant has stated that the primary reason for this request is to permit the occupancy of a portion of the commercial area that has lost its non-conforming status.

The commercial development serves the apartment complex and the immediate neighborhood, and does not appear to produce any adverse affect on surrounding properties.

Field inspection reveals that off-street parking for this complex does not meet the minimum requirements of the Zoning Code. The commercial area utilizes the public right-of-way for off-street parking. The on-site parking for the apartment use totals approximately 33, 18 covered stalls and approximately 15 spaces along the south property line which are unimproved.

The Board believes that if this request is given favorable consideration the off-street parking should be enforced to meet minimum standards (1 space for each dwelling unit).

The site does have area for both active and passive recreation. There is an area on the South side of the apartment building, and Durant Park directly to the East.

The proposed change would be contrary to the Central City Plan projections, which indicates two-story townhouse developments for this area, but it should also be pointed out that the existing zoning ("D" apartment) also allows development contrary to the plan. In either case the square footage of land would not permit any further physical changes to take place.

The Board believes that because of the stability of the existing use it would be unreasonable to assume that the operation would be phased out in the near future to make way for the townhouse development as proposed in the Central City Plan.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds reported in regard to appraisal costs for Urban Renewal Project No. 2.

SS-44-67

Motion by Black, seconded by Reynolds, that the Staff be instructed to conduct an immediate study of the probable affect of the proposed relocation of the Capitol building West of Pine Street on the Central Business District and on the present land use and traffic pattern around the proposed site as proposed in the Master Plan.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Meeting adjourned at 10:10 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

T/C

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICE BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Special Meeting, December 26, 1967

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Russel A. Lawler.

ROLL CALL

Commissioners present: Henry Noack, Robt. Rollis, Jr.; Harry Guyselman, Robt. Brooks, Leonard McConnell, and Russel Lawler—6.

Commissioners Absent: S. Don Potter, and Elizabeth Lawry—2.

Commissioners Potter and Lawry were excused from the meeting.

Motion by Comm. Guyselman—

I move that the proposed administrative changes for the Lansing Police Department to develop and staff a Personnel and In-

spections Division, and an Investigative Division be authorized, and the Chief be given the power to give it immediate effect.

Supported by Comm. Nosack.

Carried Unanimously.

The next regular board meeting will be held on the 9th of January, 1968, at 7:30 P.M., and will then determine the regular meeting dates.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 P.M.

THOMAS W. O'TOOLE,
Inspector,
Acting as Secretary in absence
of Board Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, December 5, 1967

Meeting called to order at 7:50 P.M. by Chairman Ramona Bretz.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds—5.

Absent: Duncan, Heino and Siebert—3.

Mr. Guernsey announced that since six members of the Board were not present, those zoning matters on the agenda would be referred to December 19, 1967.

HEARINGS

Z-121-67

Mr. Ronald Nino, discussed the proposed development in regard to location, size and proposed use which is 220 dwelling units plus a community center, with approximately 2 parking spaces per unit.

A representative of Mr. Lee Halstead, the developer, spoke in regard to the surrounding land use. He presented revised plans being considered which proposes some townhouses which would reduce the originally proposed density.

Also presented pictures of the type of buildings proposed for the property.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-147-67

Mr. Richard Berry, petitioner, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 4200 block of Lowcroft Street, from "A-1" family to "C-2" family district.

Mr. Berry stated he proposed the two family zoning on the subject property basically because of the commercial property to the east and also other two family in the area now being developed.

Z-148-67

Mr. Elvin Childers, petitioner, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 2816 Miller Road, from "A-1" family to "H" light industrial district.

Mr. Childers stated the purpose of the petition is to return the property to its use before annexation to the City and to be in conformance with the Code.

Mr. Gaus asked if there was any other light industrial usage in the area, and Mr. Childers replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Jack Brown, 2700 W. Miller Road, presented a petition in opposition to the proposed amendment containing forty two names of concerned property owners.

A letter from Mr. Alonzo Stone in opposition to the proposed amendment was received and placed on file.

Discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-150-67

Mr. Basil, petitioner, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 2328 Commonwealth, from "B-1" family to "H" light industrial district.

Mr. Basil stated that the subject property is undesirable as residential property due to the fertilizer works close by. He wants to store tools on the property.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-151-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 5510 S. Logan Street,

from "A-1" family to "F" commercial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-152-67

Mr. Thomas Sinas, attorney representing the petitioner, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 521 N. Capitol Avenue, from "D-M" multiple dwelling to "D-1" professional district.

Mr. Sinas stated the present use of the property has been used as "D-1" professional. Three doctors have been practicing there for nine to ten years, and recently have moved. It is a non-conforming use.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-153-67

Mr. Francis Fine, petitioner, appeared in regard to the application to rezone property at 3000-3500 N. Waverly Road, from "A-1" family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Mr. Fine stated the request is to rezone that portion of the land that is designated in the Master Plan as low density multiple housing. Eventual use of the property, if the zoning is granted, would be low rental housing on the site, all factors being acceptable.

Mr. Black asked Mr. Fine if he would have any objections to using the North half of the property for a turnkey project and reserve the South half for more conventional development? The reason for asking is that I voted against the turnkey development before in this area principally because we had assumed that the Council would follow the Planning Board's recommendation with respect to the property to the East, and that the whole area would be developed as residential high potential tax base property. Now that the property to the East has been zoned commercial, however, it makes an entirely different situation and personally I would have no objection to a turnkey on the North half of this under these circumstances specially provided if your own commercial request is approved. But I believe the South half of it should be reserved for something else. So I am asking you if you object to splitting this into two parts

Discussion followed regarding what constitutes the North and South halves of the property.

Mr. Fine stated he could not answer this question since he did not have all the pertinent facts available to him at the moment.

Mr. Fine indicated that it would be possible to put turnkey project on the area which had formerly been designated as elderly housing, provided we would ask for "D-M" on a conventional basis on the balance of the property. He concluded that he was not prepared to make a firm commitment at this time.

Mr. Michael Doyle stated that there were approximately 100 people present who were interested in what is done with the subject property. He stated they would like to be kept informed as to anything done with this property. Primarily we are here to let you know we are interested in proper planning on this property.

Mr. Andy Leitz asked for a clarification of Mr. Black's feelings on the matter and Mr. Black reiterated his previous comments.

Discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-154-67

Forest Rambo appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 3012 N. East Street, from "A-1" family and "F" commercial to "J" parking and "E" commercial.

Mr. Rambo explained the purpose of the petition which is to allow ingress and egress off N. East Street and to permit the erection of an advertising sign. This is necessary in order to operate this business at this location. Presented plan showing the layout of proposed entrances and exits. This is a Burger King drive-in type restaurant.

Leroy Henry, Burger King operator, spoke in behalf of the proposed amendment.

Discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-155-67

Edward Meier appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 1718 Indiana Avenue, from "B-1" family to "C-2" family district.

Mr. Meier stated he did not realize the zoning when he bought the property, he is thinking of either selling or renting the upstairs, so he needs the rezoning to make the conversion legal and allow him or further owners to use the property as two family.

No one spoke in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-156-67

Mr. John Stump appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 329 Regent Street, from "B-1" family to "F-1" commercial district.

Mr. Stump stated he was representing both the seller and the buyer in this case. Pictures depicting the land features of the surrounding property were presented. Mr. Stump discussed the surrounding land use, stating he thought it would be compatible with the proposed construction of a gas station and auto wash building on the site.

No one appeared in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Black, seconded by Fink, that the minutes of November 21, 1967 be approved subject to the following change:

Page 6, SS-44-67 motion by Black, regarding relocation of the Capitol to read as follows:

"Motion by Black, seconded by Reynolds, that the Staff be instructed to conduct an immediate study of the probable effect of the proposed relocation of the Capitol building west of Pine Street on the Central Business District and on the present land use and traffic pattern around the proposed site as proposed in the Master Plan."

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

STREETS COMMITTEE

S-12-67P

Mr. Fink expressed his concern over terrain of the subject property. Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus, that the existing contours shall not be graded to less than 6% except for streets which should be planned for less gradient.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus and Reynolds—5.

Nays: None.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Fink, that the preliminary plat of Greenfield Sub-

division be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Final Plat to be developed with full public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and Lansing Subdivision Regulations.
2. The East-West Street paralleling Jolly Road shall be extended to the East property line.
3. The necessary easements for storm and sanitary sewers should be provided.
4. All lots shall be graded so that whenever possible water will drain therefrom. Existing contours shall not be graded to less than 6% except for streets which should be planned for less gradient.
5. The Bear Swamp drain should be shown on the face of the final plat.
6. Street right-of-way shall be 66 feet with 36 foot pavement except at the North and South entrances where the right-of-way shall be 110 feet. An additional 10 feet of right-of-way shall be provided for Jolly and Dunckel Roads.
7. A plat restriction prohibiting access except at public streets to Dunckel and Jolly roads should appear on the face of the final plat.
8. Construction and Improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior to approval of the final plat.
9. This approval shall expire December 5, 1968.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds—5.

Nays: None.

S-13-67P Vercruyse Subdivision, Preliminary Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the preliminary plat of Vercruyse Subdivision be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Final Plat to be developed with public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and Lansing Subdivision Regulations.
2. Construction and improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior to approval of the final plat.
3. Street right-of-way for the extension of Attwood Street should be 60 feet with a 32 foot pavement. An additional 10 feet of right-of-way for Northrup Street should be provided.

4. Acquisition of the one foot strip of land owned by the Board of Education should be completed prior to the approval of the final plat.
5. The Haag drain easement should be shown on the final plat.
6. All lots should be graded so that storm water will drain to the street.
7. This approval shall expire December 5, 1968.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus and Reynolds—5.

Nay: None.

**S-14-67 Hospitality Motor Inn,
Preliminary Plat**

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the preliminary plat of Hospitality Motor Inn Subdivision be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Final Plat to be developed with public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act and Lansing Subdivision Regulations.
2. Construction and Improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior to approval of the final plat.
3. All required easements should be recorded on the face of the Final Plat.
4. A 50 foot dedication for Collins Road and a 60 foot dedication for Jolly Road should be provided.
5. The area to be occupied by the service station should be a separate lot in the final plat.
6. Access should be constructed in accordance with the recommendations of the City Traffic Engineer and Michigan Department of State Highways as shown on the plan on file in the Planning Department.
7. All lots shall be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.
8. This approval shall expire December 5, 1968.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, and Reynolds—5

Nay: None.

BUILDINGS AND PROPERTIES

**SS-46-67 Proposed Public Housing Sites on
Individual Scattered Lots**

The Board reviewed the 100 proposed sites on which the Public Housing Commission is considering constructing single family detached housing.

Discussion centered on the proposed sites location in relation to the flood plain.

Motion by Black, seconded by Reynolds, that the proposed sites, with the exception of the site on the West end of Thomas Street and any site which may lie within the flood plain, be approved as to character, location, and extent, for possible sites for public housing.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, and Reynolds—5

Nay: None.

Mr. Brown suggested that the proposed sites be submitted to the Water Resources Commission for their determination of the location of the sites in relation to the flood plain.

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Fink, that the site on the West end of Irvington Street also be made an exception to the Board's approval.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, and Reynolds—5

Nay: None.

URBAN RENEWAL AND HOUSING

Mr. Reynolds reported on the latest proposals submitted in regard to the downtown urban renewal project, and progress being made on the proposals which have been accepted.

Discussion followed.

ORDINANCE

Motion by Black, seconded by Fink, that a public hearing on the proposed ~~flood~~ plain control ordinance be set for 7:00 P.M., December 19, 1967 Court Room No. 1, 6th Floor, City Hall. Board members to receive a copy of the revised proposed ordinance prior to the meeting of the 19th of December. A time limit of one half hour is deemed sufficient for this hearing.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Subdivision Ordinance

Mr. Black stated that the draft of the subdivision control has been reviewed and the Committee has recommended the Staff also review this matter with local groups who are directly involved in development, after which a public hearing will be held.

Unanimous approval of the motion requiring review with local interested groups was granted by the Board.

SS-25-67 Policy Plan for Planned Unit Development

Mr. Black reported that the proposed policy had been reviewed by the Committee, and he commented on the planning effectuation phase of the proposal.

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the Policy Plan for Planned Unit Development be approved subject to the deletion of the word detailed in regard to site and landscape plans, and also a change of wording and numerical order of those items under planning effectuation as related to the Staff by the Ordinance Committee.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, and Reynolds—5

Nays: None.

Mr. Brown suggested a joint meeting between the Ordinance Committee and the Zoning Committee of the Planning Board to consider the South Logan Street Zoning Policy (SS-14-67). Meeting set for December 13, 1967 at 6:00 at the Bretz Shop for discussion of the proposed South Logan Zoning Policy.

FINANCE

Mr. Guernsey reported in regard to funds due the department for their work on the Community Shelter Plan Program. It is being asked of City Council that these funds be set aside for Planning Consultant Account.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus, that those funds due the Department for their work on Federally funded programs be delegated to the Planning Consultant Account.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Guernsey reported that the City Council authorized the Mayor and City Clerk to submit a second application for Model Cities planning grant. The Planning Department was actively involved in the preparation of the first application and have been asked by the Mayor to go to Chicago for briefing by the Federal officials on the second application.

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the Mayor and City Council be commended for their prompt and aggressive action in pursuing a second Model Cities application for the City of Lansing.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Guernsey reported that the City Council adopted the Central City Plan with some modifications.

Discussion followed.

Meeting adjourned at 11:50 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.
T/C

A motion was made and seconded that the Board recommend to City Council that a Traffic Signal Division be established in the Traffic Department.

Carried.

Board member Nama stated the need for enforcement of the stop signs on William at Division and at Pine.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

LANSING TRAFFIC BOARD,

ALLEN T. HAYES,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, December 19, 1967

Meeting called to order at 7:10 P.M. by Chairman Ramona Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—5.

Absent: Duncan, Fink and Heino—3.

Mrs. Bretz turned the meeting over to Mr. Black, Vice-Chairman of the Board.

HEARINGS

SS-4-67 Flood Plain Ordinance

James A. Church, Planning Department Staff, discussed the proposed ordinance in regard to the purpose, definition, flood plain, boundaries, uses permitted within the designated flood plain, uses permitted by special permit, the procedure for special permit for use of the flood plain, the existing uses in the flood plain, the city liability, and enforcement of the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Black read the recommended changes in the proposed ordinance as stated by the Assistant City Attorney concerning the purpose, uses permitted, and the procedure for special permit for use of the flood plain.

Mr. James Fiser, son of Claude Fiser of Fiser and Fiser Supply Company, spoke in regard to the proposed ordinance. He questioned the possible devaluation of the land between Jolly, Cavanaugh, Pennsylvania, and Aurelius Roads, because of the proposed prohibition of dumping or back filling subject to special conditions.

Mr. Guernsey stated that the subject land could be used as industrial use provided the special conditions as proposed in the ordinance are complied with.

Discussion followed.

Mr. Duncan arrived at 7:30 P.M.

Mr. C. R. Stebbins, Chairman of the River Improvement Committee spoke in support of the proposed ordinance.

Mrs. Joan Brigham, Natureway Association, spoke in support of the proposed ordinance. She also stated she had a letter from the Lansing Audubon Society in support of this proposal.

Mr. Dick Neller, speaking for both Walter Neller Company and the Lansing Home Builders Association, commented in regard to the need for such a control.

However, the section in regard to dumping or back filling needs a very close study and he asked for an explanation of the procedure for getting special use permits.

Mr. Claude Fiser, Fiser Supply Company, spoke in regards to the proposed ordinance (reiterated remarks of son James Fiser above).

Mr. Theodore Haskell, City Parks and Recreation Department, spoke in support of the proposed ordinance.

Clyde Stephens, surveyor, spoke in regard to the proposed ordinance concluding

that a suitable ordinance should be written and it should be augmented and revised in regard to the flood channel. The precise specifications of the flood channel should be defined in that the flood channel has a great significance, and that the controls should not be as great in the flood channel as in the flood plain itself.

Mr. Dale Granger, hydraulic engineer, with the State Water Resources Commission called to the Board's attention a technical deficiency in the proposed ordinance. New Plat Law Act 288, 1967 Rule 301 Subsection 3 which says any land platted for residential purposes, that land that lies within an area that is defined by the limits of a 50 year flood contour limit line, will not be acceptable only under limited circumstances for development as a subdivision. He commented in regard to the fact that the proposed ordinance used 1947 flood which has a recurrence every 45 years.

Discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Ordinance Committee.

S-16-67P McCurdy Acres No. 3 Preliminary Plat

D. Gregory Main discussed the proposed use, size and proposed right-of-way line concerning this plat. He stated the name is to be changed to Cooley Settlement.

Mr. Richard Hendra asked for a clarification of what was being considered.

Mr. William McCurdy, developer, was present.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

S-17-67P James Fox, Preliminary Plat

D. Gregory Main discussed the proposed plat in regard to location, size, and land use in the area.

Mr. Fox, the developer was present. Gave no comments.

Mater was referred to the Streets Committee.

SS-45-67

Mrs. Nicholson, Peez Real Estate, appeared in regard to the petition filed by Mr. and Mrs. Rodney E. Palmer, to grant a special use permit for ambulance service at 2300 E. Grand River Avenue.

Mrs. Nicholson spoke in behalf of the petitioner in regard to the need for the special use permit and the difficulty in finding property suitable for this use.

Mr. Palmer, petitioner, was present and spoke in regard to the need for the permit.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-142-67

Mr. James Hovey, attorney, requested that the petition to rezone property at 912, 922, 924 S. Pennsylvania Avenue, be referred to the next regular meeting of the Planning Board.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-189-67

Reamer Wigle spoke in regard to the petition to rezone property at 4326 S. Cedar Street.

Mr. Wigle stated that the property owners immediately to the South and to the North of the subject property have requested to be included in this petition, and a letter had been written to this effect to the City Council.

He submitted photographs showing the commercial development of this area along S. Cedar Street. Letter received and referred to the Zoning Committee.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Recess 8:30 to 9:12 P.M.

Z-95-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Harold Placer, to approve a parcel in the 3600 block Richmond Street, described as:

Lot No. 7 Placer Subdivision

for a Community Unit Plan be granted and that the plan include the following:

- a) The automobile parking areas be depressed by not less than 30 inches below the finished grade of the apartment buildings.
- b) The parking area as shown on the site plan shall be constructed according to specifications satisfactory to the City Engineer, to include hard surfacing and adequate provisions for storm drainage.
- c) The developer shall complete the construction of his landscaped plan as

amended above not less than three months after completion of his buildings or about 25% occupancy of the total number of units whichever occurs first.

1. The proposed development is not incompatible with the established land use pattern and therefore will not adversely affect adjacent property.
2. Approval to this development is not inconsistent with the public health, safety, morals and general welfare of the area in that public services will not be overburdened, the development will accrue benefits to the City and traffic problems it appears will not result from the development.
3. The area could not in all probability be developed with single family homes as the amenities in support of this type of environment are absent.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-124-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by J. Carroll Barber, to rezone a parcel in the 2800 block of Pleasant Grove Road, described as:

Commencing 215.76 ft. S. of the N.E. corner of the N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the S.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 30, T4N, R2W, running thence W. 330 ft. thence N. 215.76 ft. thence W. 990 ft. thence S. 660 ft. thence E. 790.15 ft. thence N. 301 ft. thence E. 527 ft. thence N. to the point of beginning 146 ft.

from "A-1" residential single family to Community Unit Plan be denied.

1. In the opinion of the Board the proposed development is incompatible with the established land use pattern and therefore will adversely affect adjacent property.
2. These adverse affects do not promote the intent and purposes of sound planning objectives and would not contribute to the public health, safety, morals and general welfare of the area. These criteria address themselves to the adverse effects on abutting property additional public costs, and increased traffic problems.
3. There is no good and sufficient reason why this property cannot be developed with the adjoining properties.

A petition containing approximately 113 signatures in opposition was presented to the Board. There were approximately 33 people present in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-127-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Pat DeLuca, to rezone a parcel in the 1900 block Alpha Street, described as:

The W. 99 ft. of Lot No. 47, Assessor's Plat No. 44, City of Lansing, County of Ingham, State of Michigan

from "A-1" family to "J" parking district be granted, and further recommends

The East 55 ft. of Lot No. 47, Assessor's Plat No. 44, City of Lansing, County of Ingham, State of Michigan,

which is zoned "F-1" commercial be zoned to "J" parking district.

Screening to be provided along the South line of Lot 47, except for a 20 ft. setback on Alpha Street.

Lighting to be provided on the parking area at a minimum of 2/10 lumens light per square foot, so directed as not to affect adjacent properties or passing motorist.

The proposed change would be in conformance with the Master Land Use Plan, which indicates a neighborhood shopping complex for the area.

The use of the property would be devoted to the existing commercial development to the North, and would provide for additional off-street parking, with any proposed expansion of the commercial area. The Board believes that this change could provide for any overflow of parking that may exist from the church adjacent to this site.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-128-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommends to City Council that the petition by Mr. and

Mrs. Arnold Sprayman, to rezone a parcel at Bedford Street, described as:

Lot No. 22 Westchester, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan from "A-1" residential to "C-2" family district be denied.

One purpose of zoning is to secure a reasonable development pattern by keeping similar and related use together and separating dissimilar and unrelated uses.

The site under consideration is located within an area that is zoned and developed in single family homes. The Board believes that a zoning variance for this property would be a step toward changing the character of the existing zoning district, and would not be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of planning principals.

The site is located at the intersection of two streets, one of which is a major arterial. Orientation of any new development can be to the interior residential street (Bedford Road) which would help reduce any adverse influences of traffic and activity along Mt. Hope Avenue.

The property is surrounded by one of the better residential developments in the City, and there are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be developed in accord with the existing regulations.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment, however, two letters were received in opposition to the amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-129-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Lloyd and Velma Grabo, to rezone a parcel in the 1800 block of Ada Street, described as:

Lot 18, except the East 120.0 feet thereof, Block 5, of Assessor's Plat No. 28 of Potter's Subdivision on S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 22, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "B-1" residential to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied.

Any change of zoning should be in conformance with an overall plan, and relate to the established land use pattern of the district in which it is located.

The request for the site under consideration would not conform to the established land use development, and would;

1. Adversely affect living conditions in the immediate area, principally through the increase of traffic and activity.

2. Allow a more dense development in an area that, according to the Community Renewal Survey the land use would remain at status-quo, with minor rehabilitation taking place. A change of land use would be a step toward changing the character of the area and may therefore deter the improvement of adjacent properties.

It is further pointed out that Ada Street terminates on the South boundary of this site, with no turn around for existing residential traffic, or service vehicles such as fire trucks, and snow removal equipment. If development of the subject parcel is held in accord with existing zoning ("B-1" family) it would be to utilize a portion of the property for the purpose of providing a turn-around.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-130-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Mobil Oil Corporation, to rezone a parcel at 929 North Cedar Street, described as:

Lot 8, Block 21 original plat in the City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "C-2" family to "E-2" drive-in district be granted.

The site under consideration is proposed to be used in conjunction with the two lots to the South, which were zoned "E-2" drive-in in 1965.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area for industrial expansion, which would eventually promote redevelopment of the entire area.

The Community Renewal Survey also indicates this area for redevelopment.

The change as requested would be somewhat contrary to the proposed land use, but previous action regarding the lots to the South have established a precedent.

The additional land will allow for proper building set-back from the intersection of two major streets, and an additional point of ingress set-back further from the main intersection.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-132-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommends to City Council that the petition by T. G. McGurkin, Jr., Attorney, for Edward W. Sparrow Hospital Association, to rezone a parcel at 1110 Jerome Street, described as:

N. 45 feet of Lot 3, Amended Plat of Downer's Sunnyside Addition

from "D-M" multiple dwelling to "J" parking district be granted.

The site under consideration has been cleared of building structure, and the ground surface prepared for black-top.

The proposed change would not be contrary to the established land use pattern of the area, which is developed in a public and quasi public nature.

It would be reasonable to assume that the balance of this block West of the subject parcel will eventually be developed in conjunction with the hospital facility.

Ingress and egress to the site will be from Jerome Street which functions as a collector street for the existing uses.

The Board does not believe the change will have any adverse affect on the existing or future land use development for the area.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-133-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Leo A. Farhat, acting for William and Shirley Warner, to rezone a parcel at Lockbridge Drive and Norburn Way, described as:

Lots 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, and 169 of Marscot Meadows No. 3, a subdivision on part of the W. $\frac{1}{2}$ of the N.E. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section

10, T3N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family to "C-2" family district be granted.

The planning and development of raw land should be patterned closely after the "Ideal" community envisaged by the Comprehensive Master Plan. The ideal community is made up of neighborhoods which has been provided with all of the services which form an urban environment, i.e., utilities, sidewalks, etc. Other facilities which should be considered necessary are schools, parks, churches, shopping areas and a diversity of housing type. The emerging neighborhood in which these lots are located is presently lacking some of these facilities, however, the area is not developed beyond the point where these objectives cannot be met.

The increased density proposed is in agreement with the preliminary design developed by the Board for this area. The design proposed a basic retention of the low density residential development with an increased density along the I-96 expressway.

The lot sizes are well in excess of the recommended minimum for two-family zoning.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-134-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Francis and Wilma Moore, to rezone a parcel at 2717 N. Logan Street, described as:

Lot 10, Supervisor's Plat of Deihm Farms

from "A" residential to "E-2" drive-in district, be denied as filed and that portion of Lot 10 described as:

Commencing 17 ft. West of the S.E. corner of Lot 10 Supervisor's Plat of Deihm Farms, thence West to the S.W. corner of Lot 10, thence North on the West line of Lot 10, 61 ft., thence Southeasterly to the point of beginning be zoned from "A-1" to "E-2" district.

The proposed change would not be contrary to the established land use development of the area. Development of this area is mixed, and in many cases does not conform to the zoning regulations, regard-

ing set-backs, off-street parking, and use regulations. A change of zoning on this site will in effect eliminate these conditions.

The overall site is exposed to the intersection of Logan and Grand River Avenue, both of which are State Trunklines, ingress and egress to the site is a critical factor to be considered. The Planning Division of the State Highway Department has indicated that the granting or denial of this request would not affect their plans, but suggest that if the request is granted, a site plan be submitted to the District 8 Traffic Engineer for recommendation concerning access.

The Board does not believe the change will have any adverse affect on adjoining property or the general welfare.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-136-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by D. M. Tamburino, acting for 20th Century Builders, to rezone a parcel at 3333 Maloney Street, described as:

Lot No. 367 and No. 368 Pleasant Grove, Subdivision No. 1, City of Lansing, County of Ingham, State of Michigan

from "A-1" family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied.

Zoning attempts to locate the various uses of land in some form of relationship to each other, and in relationship to all transportation facilities, utilities, and public facilities and services. Zoning assumes that land differs as to the use for which it is best suited based on its relationship to other uses, physical features and facilities available.

The site under consideration is oriented to a single family residential area. The proposed development would definitely expose this area to an increase of traffic and activity. The structure proposed would be completely out of character with the existing single family development.

Storm sewers in this area were designed to accommodate development that would create a 25% impervious condition. The proposal under consideration would create a 90% impervious condition and would definitely place an additional load on existing sewers. This is especially true if other

properties in the area were given the same consideration.

The site plan does not indicate any area set aside for either active or passive recreation, nor is there any within walking distance.

Schools in the vicinity are presently operating at capacity, any increase of density would compound this problem, this is especially true if the apartment units are family oriented.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-136-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Wilson Perry, to rezone a parcel in the 6000 and 6012 S. Logan, described as:

Lots 12 and 13, Webster Farm Subdivision No. 1, Delhi Township, Ingham County, Michigan, now City of Lansing

from "A" one family residential to "F" commercial district be denied.

The site under consideration is located within the strip commercial development along the area of South Logan Street. Much of this development occurred prior to annexation, without adequate zoning controls.

Strip zoning most frequently is commercial strip zoning along highways (Logan Street). The mistaken philosophy is that, simply because land is located along a highway, the frontage has the right of being developed for commercial purposes. This usually results in a two or three hundred foot deep strip being established as a business or commercial zone on both sides of the highway. This is one of the most destructive misconceptions in zoning. Strip zoning will lead to blighted conditions and will lead to a deterioration of the community.

It is pointed out in the Master Plan that: Lansing's commercial areas suffer from five major problems, one of which is the "Ribbon" or "Strip Commercial Development." To solve this problem and attempt to avoid their recurrence in the future, existing shopping centers should be refashioned and new ones built to modern standards. Desirability commercial uses should not develop, as many have in the past, with stores strung out along major streets or located on all four cor-

ners of an intersection. Such arrangements cause inconvenience and hazards for shoppers, failure to provide adequate parking, and result in poor business for merchants and poor investments for property owners.

It is considered preferable to group commercial uses in an integrated center with sufficient depth of property to provide for parking, and otherwise so designed to allow for safe and expeditious movements of traffic.

Areas along Cedar Street are good examples of deteriorating strip commercial development. Buildings are vacant, several conversions have taken place, encroachment into the residential areas have adversely affected living conditions, and in general, curb cuts have been issued at random, creating many points of traffic conflict. The Community Renewal Survey indicates many of these areas for major rehabilitation.

The Board believes that any change of zoning along Logan Street or any other area of the City, should be in conformance with an over-all development or policy plan. In this case a policy plan has been introduced and is pending adoption and support from the governing body.

The Policy Plan indicates (3) avenues of approach:

1. Zone those things, conforming as to use, that are judged to be essential and are not met in conflict with the area needs.

The present use on the property is community oriented, and does not depend on the immediate area for support.

2. Institute a method of phasing out those uses which are judged to be incompatible as to use and/or use bulk, and location on lot.

This change would be in direct conflict with existing land use development.

The adjacent property owner to the West did voice a complaint, as to the maintenance of the fence at the rear of the existing commercial use.

3. Encourage intensified residential development using all means available including platting, community unit development, and development of complexes using varied types of residential structures. Prior to development capital improvement scheduling of the necessary utilities must be programmed.

Utilities are not available to serve this area.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-137-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by (Hilda Musselman) First Church of Christ, Scientist, to rezone a parcel at 316 Genesee Street, from "D" apartment to "J" parking district be denied.

The site under consideration is located in an area that is developed in a residential nature.

Field inspection reveals that development in the area is in conformance with the zoning regulations, in that there is no off-street parking within the required front yards. The requested change would allow front yard parking and would establish a precedent for any future redevelopment of the area.

The present zoning of the site ("D" apartment) does allow development for off-street parking with a front yard setback of approximately 20 ft. The Board believes that this is in keeping with the general intent of the Zoning Regulations and development in the area.

Adjacent property owners have indicated that they would not object to the proposed change, providing it does not affect their means of ingress to their property. A fence along the West line of the property would make it difficult, if not impossible for the owner at 320 West Genesee to gain access to their garage.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-138-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the petition to rezone property at 1601 E. Cavanaugh Road, from "A-1" family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be tabled 30 days to January 16, 1968 to enable the Board to consider the revised plan submitted by the petitioner.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-139-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the petition to rezone property at 4326 S. Cedar Street, from "C-2" family

to "F" commercial district be tabled to the January 2, 1968 meeting to enable the Board to consider the two adjacent properties on the North and South of the original property as requested by the petitioner.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-140-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Wayne A. Wilson, to rezone a parcel at 2812-2816 Cynwood, described as:

Lot 13 and 14 of Supervisor's Plat of Cynwood Heights, Lansing, Michigan

from "A-1" residential to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied, and further recommend that the parcel N.E. of this site which is zoned "F" commercial be rezoned back to residential. This would reduce the possibility of any further adverse affects on the adjacent residential development.

The site under consideration is located within an area of modest residential development. Street improvements pertaining to curb and gutter have not been installed. Sanitary sewers serve the area at the present time, but no storm sewers exist within the area, nor are they programmed for the immediate future.

The proposed use would definitely expose the existing development to an increase of traffic and activity. Depriving the residence of the single family characteristics, and may deter the improvement or development in the area.

The structure proposed would be completely out of character with existing residential development.

The site plan submitted for the proposed project does not indicate any area for either active or passive recreation, nor is there any public facilities in the vicinity.

The Board does not believe the adjacent commercial use has contributed to the sub-standard condition or the subject property, but is merely neglect on the property owners part.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-141-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to

City Council that the petition by John E. Wolfe, to rezone a parcel at 3007 N. East Street, from "A" one district to "F" commercial district be denied as filed, and that the South 80 ft. and the West 20 ft. of the property be rezoned from "A" one family to "J" parking, and the balance of the property be rezoned from "A" one family to "F" commercial.

Screening to be provided along the West property line, except for a 25 ft. set-back on Howe Avenue.

Development of this area took place prior to annexation to the City without proper zoning controls. Commercial uses were allowed to intermix with residential uses, off-street parking and improvements were not provided for, set-backs were not given initial consideration, advertising signs, and curb cuts were constructed at random. The end result has lead to blighted conditions and will lead to further deterioration of the community if some sort of policy and land use control is not applied to the situation.

The Logan Street Policy Plan indicates a method of attack and treatment to this type of land development. The major problem to this approach is that no policy has been initiated for North East Street, and time and monies are essential from both the property owners and city's view point.

The site under consideration is developed in a commercial nature. Sanitary sewers serve the site, and the closest storm sewer is approximately one block to the South.

The structure on the property is quite new and setback from both streets adequately, off-street parking is available for most of any type of use that may be proposed. Yet any major alterations or additions to the existing structure are prohibited, because of the non-conforming status.

Based on these facts it would be difficult to deny the request, which we know could contribute to further strip commercial development in this area, and establish a precedent for other properties.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-142-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the petition to rezone property at 912, 922 and 924 S. Pennsylvania Avenue be tabled for 30 days for the January 16, 1968 meeting.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-143-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Donald H. Sanderson, to rezone a parcel at 4400 Christiansen Road, from "A" one family residential to "C-2" family district be denied.

Zoning assumes that land differs as to use for which it is best suited based on its relationship to other uses, physical features and facilities available.

The site under consideration is located within a predominately single family area.

The change in itself may not affect the area, but would introduce a change in land use that would justify future changes in the area, and eventually change its entire character.

This type of change would affect those who could not afford or did not desire to change their single family environment.

Street improvements have not been completed. The area lacks curb, gutter and sidewalks.

Sanitary sewer serves the area, but storm sewers will have to be installed.

Based on the foregoing analysis the Board does not believe the requested change would be in keeping with sound zoning controls.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-144-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Robert B. Quandt, to rezone a parcel at 1032 N. Capitol Avenue, from "C-2" family to "D-1" professional district be denied.

The site is located within an area where there is a very defined zoning district line and land use development pattern.

There should be compelling reasons for changing the established district, that are substantially related to the public welfare and necessity.

In this case the change would be contrary to the established land use pattern. The introduction of this change could adversely affect living conditions in the immediate area, principally through the increase of traffic and activity. This is

especially true if further changes are made and the entire character of the area changes.

The lot is small in size and with front yard parking been prohibited, it would be difficult to provide adequate off-street parking for any other use than what is allowed under the present zoning ("C-2" family").

The office type use district has not been over looked for this area. The Central City Plan indicates a concentration of offices and services in an area bound by Capitol, Oakland, Grand and Saginaw Street.

Indiscrimination of spot-zoning of residential properties in the area will weaken the market potential of this logical and desirable office area.

No one appeared in objections to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Z-145-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the petition to rezone property at Waverly and Grand River, from "A-1" family to "F" commercial district be tabled as per the petitioner's request to the January 2, 1968 meeting.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

SS-45-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition filed by Mr. and Mrs. Rodney E. Palmer, to grant a special use permit for ambulance service at 2300 E. Grand River Avenue be denied.

It should be pointed out that Section 36-42 of the Code is rather specific in the kinds of uses which may be considered for a special use permit. An ambulance service is not permitted for consideration.

The Board is of the opinion however, that the code is too narrowly confined, and that there are other types of land uses which could be appropriately considered via this technique.

There are situations when the nature of land permits it to be used by other than the zoned uses and yet it is not desirable to re-zone the property in question to a different category because that category permits a whole range of uses which would be incompatible with the district. It is these types of gritty, inflexible approaches

that often times weaken the basis of zoning and therefore it appears that such techniques providing for greater flexibility in planning is in the interest of planning. It is true that this may lead to abuse therefore one must weigh the costs against the benefits of greater discretionary type approaches to solving land use problems.

The Board is however of the opinion that given the constraints of a public hearing, and review by the Planning Board and Council and the establishment of guidelines for the consideration of such special use permits that the problem can be reasonably controlled.

We would recommend that Section 36-42 be amended to include an "Ambulance Service" as follows:

Provided That:

- (1) The location fronts on a street designated on the Master Plan as a primary or secondary thoroughfare.
- (2) The lot contains an area of at least 6000 square feet and have a minimum frontage of 50 feet.
- (3) The location is not less than 600 feet from any elementary or secondary school.
- (4) All motor vehicles are housed within an accessory building.

The Board believes that using the above kind of approach can be substantiated on the basis that the type of land uses that this technique proposes to provide a solution to occurs infrequently as a land use. In other words special use permits are in the opinion of the Board ideal methods for accommodating infrequent or minimum type land users, provided adequately criteria are developed as in the above proposal for their development.

The property which is the subject of this petition fails to meet the criteria in that the parcel of land is only 3,894 square feet and is situated within 600 feet of an elementary school.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

SS-14-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the South Logan Street Zoning Policy be referred to the January 16, 1968 meeting of the Planning Board due to the fact that additional material had been submitted

which requires the Board's further consideration of the matter.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

S-17-67P James Fox, Preliminary Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Duncan that the preliminary plat by James Fox be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Final Plat to be developed with public improvements as required by the Michigan State Plat Act, and Lansing Sub-division Regulations.
2. Construction and improvement drawings should be submitted and approved prior to approval of the final plat.
3. Street right-of-way should be 60 feet with a 32 foot pavement. An additional 10 feet of right-of-way for Northrup Street should be provided.
4. Allocation of the necessary park land for street purposes by the Parks Board and City Council should be completed prior to approval of the final plat.
5. The Haag drain easement should be shown on the final plat.
6. All lots should be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.
7. This approval shall expire December 19, 1968.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

BUILDINGS AND PROPERTIES

BP-5-67

Motion by Duncan, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board advise City Council that the offer by Jessie H. Leggett, to sell property in the Jones Lake area (624 Fairfield Avenue) to the City was considered by the Board and it is recommended that the City negotiate with the owner of the property for a price more in line with the City Assessor's appraisal.

With the future expansion and development of the east side of Jones Lake as a neighborhood park site, this parcel of land could be incorporated with the parcels to the North as a part of the park. The Parks Department states that the parcel of land would be desirable for the proposed Jones Lake Park.

The City Assessor has made an appraisal of the property and would place a value of

\$865.00 for the property, and states that he believes the City can obtain the rights to what is shown as Fairfield Avenue and Cameron.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yea: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

ORDINANCE

SS-21-67

Amend Central City Plan in regard to office districts. This matter to be referred to the January 2, 1968 meeting of the Planning Board.

Motion by Bretz, seconded by Siebert, that the first regular meeting of the Planning Board in January of 1968 be held on January 2, 1968 as regularly scheduled and all new zonings be referred to January 16, 1968 meeting of the Board.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Duncan, seconded by Gaus, that a Committee of the Board consider altering the rules of procedure regarding the vote of six members of the Board to amend the Zoning Ordinance. To consider a majority rule rather than the six vote rule. The possibility of nine members on the Board rather than eight members should also be considered.

Mr. Guernsey stated that this matter is presently being considered by the City Attorney and an opinion on same will be forthcoming.

Matter was referred to the Executive Committee.

Meeting adjourned at 10:25 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

C/M